

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AN ODE TO THE ORIOLES

HON. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, John Kunreuther has lived in Baltimore but is a 12-year-old Scarsdale boy who is as strong an Oriole fan as we have. He composed a poem which I ask to have printed in the RECORD for the pleasure of Senators and of Oriole fans everywhere.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE OF A KIND

(By John Kunreuther)

In Baltimore, there are many jobs
Such as selling crabs to the waiting mobs
Or being a doctor or a nurse
Or being the guy who swipes a purse.

On every street in Baltimore
There is always at least one seafood store
And they all have different speciality winners
Such as fantastic crab and broiled fish dinners.

And so in Baltimore, the "happening" town,
There live a bunch of wonderful clowns,
And these very popular, talented souls
Are widely known as the Orioles.

This super team has recently shown
That a team can win with a Floyd or Salmon,
And that some time, some night, or maybe
some day

A homer can be hit by Davey May!

At first, of course, is "Booger" Powell
And later he's had the eye of an owl,
And when Boog swings the bat hard it's easy
to hear
Chuck Thompson yell, "That ball's out of
here !!!"

The Orioles want Dave and Mark to stay
So they can always get the double play;
The bad remarks about their hitting were lies
Cause both their bats have been a big
surprise.

The infield ends with B. Robbie at third
And the team sure is glad that he, too, is a
bird,
Cause even if he cannot hit
He is spectacular with the mitt.

And now we see Don Buford in left
Who is well known for his home-run theft
The opposing teams' throats have many
lumps
When Don is at the wall and jumps.

"Mr. Motormouth" is now his name
But he plays great baseball all the same,
And running for those fly-balls, Blair
Is just as speedy as any hare!

In right field is the other one
Of the two great Robinsons
He plays the game so well that he
Has twice now run the M.V.P.

When the ball hits you from behind the
plate, POW !!!
There's nothing to do but yell out, "OW! !"
And Andy and Ellie have been hit hard
But manage each game to be one who
starred.

Jim, Dave, Tom and Mike
The opposing hitters do not like
When they're good, the batters cannot hit
And they will strike out and have a fit.

Earl Weaver is the one whose
Job is in danger if his club does lose
And people call him some very bad names
When he leads the division by 15 games.

Over all this team is great
And to be the champs they cannot wait,
And when they end up winning it all
In Baltimore they'll have a BALL! !

MEDIC

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, the development of vast medical centers, rapid advances in the medical sciences, heightened concern over health care, and the passage of historic social legislation have combined to pose a new and awesome challenge to the hospital community of our Nation.

Essentially, the problem lies in the need for close coordination between the various hospital departments, so as to assure the highest level of patient care and to help management to achieve the most effective utilization of its resources.

From the time a patient enters the hospital until the time he is discharged, there is a constant flow of information about the patient among the many departments that have concern for his health and well-being. However, in hospitals today, redtape and mountains of paperwork impedes efforts to provide optimum patient care.

Now, along with the many other wondrous functions it can perform, the computer has come to the aid of hospitals whose basic mission, the treatment and care of the sick, is hampered by inadequate communications systems.

One of the most notable developments is a system, known appropriately enough as MEDIC, the result of a joint effort by Gamut Systems, Inc., of New York and the renowned St. Barnabas Medical Center in Livingston, N.J.

This unique, new shared hospital and medical information system was developed to substantially reduce the administrative, nursing, and medical paperwork concerning patient care. The most remarkable feature of MEDIC is that it provides hospital personnel with automated handling of information on some 90 percent of patient-related activities. Hundreds of thousands of man-hours of recordkeeping are taken out of the hospital and turned over to the computer.

This includes total information concerning admissions, medications, laboratory, X-ray, dietary, central service, financial reporting, patient billing, gen-

eral ledger, accounts receivable, payroll, and personnel management.

Each of these functions within the hospital, medical, or nursing center is provided by remote terminals linked via telephone lines to a central computer system at Gamut's medical information center. The computer records, correlates, updates, and disseminates necessary information concerning patient activities, schedules, and daily services. All pertinent processed information is applied to the financial and management reporting system to allow for accurate and timely patient billing, accounts receivable, medical insurance, and medicare proration, inventory control, and control of drug and medication utilization.

The cost to the hospital community for this remarkable service is dramatically reduced through the simultaneous use and sharing of Gamut's central computer by several hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, Gamut Systems and St. Barnabas Medical Center merit the highest praise for bringing to bear their imagination, resourcefulness, skill, and determination in creating a system which I believe is an important asset to institutions concerned with providing quality health care for the American public.

THE RUSSIAN JEWS

HON. ALAN CRANSTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, the living conditions and psychological atmosphere for Jewish citizens of the U.S.S.R. remains intolerable. I ask unanimous consent that the following case study describing this situation be printed in the RECORD.

Although some Jews are being released from the Soviet Union under the reunification-of-families program promised by Premier Kosygin in December 1966, the intensity of the problem continues.

Politically the Soviet Union is fearful of opening its emigration gates wide because of the huge exodus which would obviously occur, thus giving the Soviets a propaganda black eye.

The second part of the political problem is that Russian Jews are being used as political pawns and hostages within the U.S.S.R. so as to increase tensions in the already volatile Middle East situation. With these pressures the lid is unfortunately being kept on one of the U.S.S.R.'s most creative group of citizens.

Mr. President, I bring the Kochubiyevsky case before you and our colleagues to demonstrate once again the maleficent situation Jews in the Soviet Union face. I am deeply concerned for their plight, and hope the Soviet Government

reconsiders its policy toward Russian Jewry, a people rich in mind and in spirit.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE OF BORIS L. KOCHUBIYEVSKY

The attached letter speaks for itself. A few biographical details are in order.

Boris Lvovich Kochubiyevsky was born in Kiev, the Ukraine, in 1936. His parents were killed by the Nazis at Babi Yar, the charnel house on the outskirts of Kiev where tens of thousands of Jews were slaughtered in September 1941.

The boy was brought up in an orphanage and attended a trade school. Later, he received an engineering degree from the Kiev Polytechnical Institute. He had no Jewish education or culture and his wife, Larisa Aleksandrovna Kochubiyevsky, is non-Jewish. Still, his experiences as a Jew in the Soviet Union made him always aware of his Jewish origins.

In June 1967, at a meeting organized at his factory to protest "Israeli aggression," Kochubiyevsky heatedly rejected the official line and upheld Israel's right of defense. At a subsequent meeting of his factory trade union, his action was discussed and he was asked to resign, which he refused to do.

At a memorial meeting at Babi Yar in February 1968, Kochubiyevsky once more openly contradicted an official Soviet line. This time he protested the Soviet policy of minimizing or even keeping silent about the Jewish massacre at Babi Yar.

In May 1968, he finally succumbed to pressure and resigned his job. That summer, he and his wife applied for exit permits to Israel; they were refused. But in November, they were given permission to leave and were told to appear at the passport office on November 28 to pick up their documents. That morning, however, their apartment was searched and many of his letters were seized, among them protest letters written to Soviet authorities.

The following week, Kochubiyevsky was arrested. His wife, after refusing pressures to leave him and divorce him, was expelled from the Teachers College where she was a student, and from the Komsomol. His arrest was based on Article 187, Chapter 1, of the Ukrainian criminal code, and it cited his statements at the above-mentioned occasions.

On January 20, 1969, his pretrial examination was concluded by the local prosecutor's office and submitted to the court—where, however, it was sent back for further investigation. The court stated that the evidence was insufficient to support the charge that he intended to disseminate anti-Soviet slanders.

The petition to the United Nations signed on May 20, 1969 by fifty-five Soviet intellectuals, calling for an investigation of "the repression of basic civil rights in the Soviet Union," protests the trial and sentence of Kochubiyevsky the week before to three years in prison.

The text of his letter to the Soviet authorities follows:

TEXT OF KOCHUBIYEVSKY LETTER

NOVEMBER 28, 1968.

To: The Secretary General of the CPSU Central Committee—Brezhnev. The First Secretary of the (Ukraine CP) Central Committee—Shelest.

Copy: to the Investigator of the Prosecutor's Office of the Shevchenko. Region of the city of Kiev—V. V. Doroshenko.

From: The accused of slander against Soviet reality—B. L. Kochubiyevsky, Jew.

I am a Jew: I want to live in the Jewish State. This is my right, just as it is the right of a Ukrainian, the right of a Russian to live in Russia and the right of a Georgian to live in Georgia.

I want to live in Israel.

This is my dream, this is the purpose not only of my life, but also of the lives of hundreds of generations which preceded me, of my ancestors expelled from their land.

I want my children to study in a school in the Hebrew language. I want to read Jewish papers, I want to go to a Jewish theatre. What is bad in this? What is my crime? Most of my relatives were shot by the fascists. My father was killed and his parents were killed. Were they alive now, they would stand at my side: Let me go!

I have appealed with this request many times to various authorities and I have achieved only this: Dismissal from my job; the expulsion of my wife from the Institute; and, to crown it all, a criminal charge of slandering Soviet reality. Of what does this slander consist? Is it slander that in the multi-national Soviet State only the Jewish people cannot teach its children in Jewish schools? Is it slander that in the USSR there is no Jewish theatre? Is it slander that in the USSR there are no Jewish papers? Incidentally, no one even denies this. Perhaps it is slander that for over a year I have not succeeded in obtaining an exit permit for Israel? Or is it slander that people don't want to talk to me, that there is no one to complain to? Nobody reacts. But even this isn't the heart of the matter. I don't want to be involved in the national affairs of a State in which I consider myself an alien. I want to go away from here. I want to live in Israel. My wish does not contradict Soviet laws.

I have an affidavit from relatives; all the formalities have been observed. Is it for this that you are starting a criminal case against me?

Is it for this that a search has been made at my house?

I don't ask you for recommendations for mercy. Listen yourselves to the voice of reason:

Let me go!

As long as I am alive, as long as I am capable of feeling, I shall devote all my strength to obtain an exit permit for Israel. And even if you should find it possible to sentence me for this—I shall anyway, if I live long enough to be freed, be ready even then to make my way even on foot to the fatherland of my ancestors.

KOCHUBIYEVSKY.

PROMISES AND ACTION

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, last fall when he was campaigning for the Presidency, Richard Nixon made it clear to the American people that the multitude of the Nation's problems would be attacked with realism, rather than with sloganeering.

Nine months have now elapsed since the Republican Administration came into power and its actions do not make an especially convincing crusade to combat the Nation's ills.

In his inaugural address, President Nixon has promised a low-key, low volume administration, and at the first 8 months in office, this is approximately the image that has emerged.

There has been restraint in appraising the successes and failures of the new administration, but now evaluations are being made by the political analysts and

by men in high places who are aware of the problems which confront the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a thoughtful appraisal of the Nixon administration by Hubert Humphrey, which appeared in the Washington Daily News last Monday, September 22, 1969. I wish to include Mr. Humphrey's observations and critique as part of my remarks.

The article follows:

NO WAY TO RUN AN AIRLINE, A RAILROAD, OR A NATION

(By Hubert Humphrey)

A year ago, six weeks before the election, Richard M. Nixon told the American people of his concept of the presidency. He said: "The next president must take an activist view of his office. He must articulate the nation's values, define its goals and marshal its will."

All thru the campaign, candidate Nixon said he would stop crime and inflation and rising taxes. He promised peace at home and abroad.

In his acceptance speech at Miami, he said: "The wave of crime is not going to be the wave of the future of the United States of America."

He said: "Let us build bridges, my friends, build bridges of human dignity across that gulf that separates black America from white America."

And he said: "I see the day when our senior citizens and millions of others can plan for the future with the assurance that their government is not going to rob them of their savings by destroying the value of the dollar."

The Republican theme in 1968 was a special concern for the silent American, the forgotten American. They pay most of the taxes. It is their dollar being eroded by inflation. They suffer from increasing costs of higher education for their sons and daughters. They are the victims of spiraling medical costs. They are being squeezed by tight credit and high interest rates. Their neighborhoods are threatened with violence and crime.

Their pain and suffering was to be eased. A new administration would set America on a new course. Let's take a look at the record.

Crime is still out of control. FBI figures for 1969 indicate a 10 per cent increase in the crime rate. After all the campaign rhetoric, Attorney General John N. Mitchell now says: "Basically, street crime is outside the jurisdiction of the federal government."

Food prices are rising 8 per cent a year. In most cities, hamburger and bacon have gone up 10 cents a pound.

Parents who sent their children to college this fall found costs up \$100 to \$200 per year. The average increase was 8 per cent.

Families who hoped to buy a new home this year have found interest rates rapidly rising, with the average rate for a new home now 8 per cent.

While the nation's housing needs are estimated at 2.5 million units per year for the next 10 years, new housing starts have dropped from an annual rate of 1.8 million in 1968 to 1.4 million this year, and the rate may drop even more.

The cost of living, which went up 3 per cent in 1967 and 4 per cent in 1968, is increasing at an annual rate of 6½ per cent under President Nixon.

The White House sat idly by while the big banks increased the prime interest rate to 8½ per cent, and there is talk of another increase.

Despite a campaign promise to the contrary, President Nixon demanded extension of the 10 per cent income tax surcharge.

A tax reform bill finally passed the House of Representatives, but it was the work of Democrats in Congress, not the Nixon administration. The bill provides \$9 billion a

year in tax relief for low and middle income families, but the Nixon administration says the House bill gives too much tax relief to the low and middle income families and not enough to business. So the administration proposal is to hand corporate business, which is already enjoying record profits, \$2 billion in extra tax relief.

Hospital and medical costs continue to rise at an alarming rate. Budget cutbacks are forcing reductions in medical research, hospital construction and neighborhood health centers.

Candidate Nixon's "black capitalism" program no longer is mentioned at the White House. "Black capitalism is a shambles," according to Whitney Young, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League.

During the campaign, candidate Nixon also emphasized that he did not want a government of "yes men." He promised an administration of "open, candid dialogue."

One of President Nixon's first nominations was that of Dr. Franklin Long to head the National Science Foundation. President Nixon called Dr. Long "a man of eminent credentials," but then when it was discovered Dr. Long opposed the Nixon ABM plan, the nomination was withdrawn. After withering criticism from the scientific community, President Nixon again reversed himself and offered the job to Dr. Long, who by this time wanted no part of the administration.

Then HEW Secretary Robert Finch selected Dr. John Knowles to be his assistant secretary for health. But top officials of the American Medical Association, which had contributed heavily to the Nixon campaign, objected. After six months of political infighting, Secretary Finch finally had to back down. Senator Charles Goodell, R., N.Y., concluded: "The choice was between filling the nation's top medical post on the basis of merit or politics. Politics won."

In March, Clifford L. Alexander, Jr., chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, was warned that businessmen were complaining of "being harassed" by the commission. He was told "it is going to stop or somebody is going to lose his job." The next day, Alexander was replaced as chairman, and in April Alexander resigned from the commission, saying, "The public conclusion is inescapable: vigorous efforts to enforce the laws on employment discrimination are not among the goals of this administration."

After eight months, it is beginning to look as if the Nixon administration may not only be veering to the right as part of a "southern strategy" of re-election, but it may not get off the ground at all.

We were told the Nixon years would be a beautiful flight into the future. What's happened? The plane made it to the end of the runway, but its engines are sputtering and it's not moving. I think one of the problems is that the pilot is looking over maps that were good in the 1950s but are out of date in 1969.

As we head into the 1970s, the flight into the promised land probably will be cancelled and passengers will be taken back to the terminal for a safer, slower horse and buggy. The forgotten American has been forgotten.

I say this is no way to run an airline, a railroad, or a nation.

AMERICAN ACADEMICS

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to an address delivered at the University of Tulsa by Daniel J. Boorstin. Just as this is not

an ordinary, run-of-the-mill speech neither is Mr. Boorstin an ordinary man.

He is a recipient of the Preston and Sterling Morton Distinguished Service Professor of History at the University of Chicago and a member of its faculty since 1944, and has been described by a reviewer for the National Observer as "no ordinary historian," but "a practitioner of 'social history,' a field that for years has struggled to gain respectability alongside the more conventional fields." Daniel Joseph Boorstin was born on October 2, 1914 in Atlanta, Ga., one of the two sons of Samuel Aaron Boorstin, a lawyer, and of Dora (Olsen) Boorstin. His grandparents on both sides of his family were Russian-Jewish immigrants. His brother, Robert L. Boorstin, is an investment counselor in Beverly Hills, Calif. Boorstin grew up in Tulsa, Okla., where he had moved with his family at the age of 2. After graduating from Central High School in Tulsa in 1930, he entered Harvard University at the encouragement of his mother. Undecided about a career, he majored in English history and in literature. At Harvard, Boorstin also served as editor of the undergraduate daily, the *Crimson*. A senior honor essay that he wrote about Edward Gibbon's "History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" brought him the Bowdoin Prize in 1934, when he graduated from Harvard summa cum laude with a B.A. degree.

Dr. Boorstin, by his own account, is a refugee from radicalism. He has a distinguished and unusual legal career, being one of the few Americans who is entitled to plead cases before the English Bar. He is a distinguished editor and author and has provided us with some excellent comments upon the current academic scene.

He has been honored by previous administrations and I am sure will continue to serve the Nation in a valuable way.

As I have said, his was not an ordinary address. It did not pit American against American, black against white, poor against rich. It freely acknowledged the existence of problems—many of which are real, others only imagined, but nearly all with us for far too many years. The majority of his talk, however, concerned itself with what is right in America, and how each of us—young and old—can and must work together to make it better.

It focuses attention on our educational system—both its successes, which are many, and its failures, which are few. But mostly it is a plea. A plea for rationality, for true intellectualism, for toleration. It is, it seems to me, a plea we can ignore only at the expense of our excellent system of education and, therefore, only at the expense of America herself. I highly recommend its being read, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TULSA,
JUNE 1, 1969

(By Daniel J. Boorstin)

Apology has become the American posture. The liberal virtue of self-criticism is be-

coming the national vice of self-hate. We seem to see everything about ourselves except what is good, everything about our past except what we have achieved. Groveling has become the national disease.

The missing ingredient in the United States today is pride. This is what the dictionary calls "a becoming or dignified sense of what is due to one's self or one's position or character; self-respect; self-esteem." We have become so accustomed to the lack of it that we have begun to imagine that our absence of self-esteem is somehow a virtue.

The accumulating symptoms are everywhere. In the United States it has always been hard to define an "intellectual." But we have now almost reached the point where an American intellectual is a person who believes that the whole community is anti-intellectual. And, similarly, the definition of a "liberal" here has been elusive. Now in the United States people who call themselves liberals tend to be those who believe that all American society is illiberal. And extremist-liberals would even seem to believe that our nation consists predominantly of imperialist, war-mongering racists.

How have we come to this plight? How can we explain that our nation which fought the Civil War, the bloodiest war of the 19th century, to secure the freedom of an oppressed minority, which in the last century and a half was the asylum for the oppressed of the world and received some fifty million immigrants, which for so long considered itself "the last best hope of mankind"—how can we explain that our spirits have fallen so low that we have made us a national costume of sackcloth and ashes?

The answer, I suggest, does not lie in an objective failure of American institutions. It is not that we have given up the struggle for a better life. It is rather that our impatient, energetic nation, plunging and pushing and pulling toward a fulfillment of democracy, has refused to face its paradoxes. A paradox, you will recall, is a statement seemingly contradictory, but actually true.

Tonight I will speak of one of the paradoxes of democracy. Of one point where our extravagant democratic hopes come up against the hard facts of life—in the world of higher education.

During the last three centuries the American People have undertaken the most widespread, perhaps the most remarkable, and probably the most successful educational experiment in history. Even in the early 17th century a law of the Massachusetts Bay Colony required each community to provide a system of public education. Free and universal public education, unheard of in the Old World, became familiar in America. Communities first provided free elementary education, then secondary education (the public high school was an American innovation).

Then, with the rise of state universities, land-grant colleges, and myriad municipal and other institutions, in our time we have provided a virtually free and nearly universal higher education. At every stage this movement has been unprecedented.

Our system of higher education is without doubt the best in the world. Our colleges and universities are by far the best staffed in faculty, the best equipped in libraries, laboratories, and classrooms. They are the most numerous and reach the largest proportion of the population. Today some 2,400 American institutions of higher learning contain a student enrollment of over 7,000,000 and faculties numbering over 500,000. The faculty members of American colleges and universities are nearly as numerous as the combined student populations of all institutions of higher learning in England and France. Our college student population itself is nearly equal to the combined total populations of persons of all ages in Denmark and Norway. About 40% of the students are women. Even

ten years ago, there were more Negroes attending American colleges and universities than the then total college population of England or of France.

Anyone who complains of the lack of opportunity for "communication" between faculty and students here should visit the other cultivated nations of the world. In Italy, Spain, Greece, and Latin America the norm is a part-time faculty. The shockingly-underpaid professors who have to piece out their incomes by other jobs, barely have time to attend their classes, much less to chat informally with students at office-hours or over a glass of beer at their homes. In great British universities we still see segregated dining facilities, offering superior cuisine for the faculty. At the Sorbonne the faculty is so dispersed, so hurried, and so jealous of one another's work, that they barely communicate with one another, much less with their students.

If American students believe their housing inadequate or their social halls ill-equipped, let them leave their stadia and their swimming pools and bowling alleys and billiard rooms and ping-pong tables and lunchrooms and take a quick trip to Paris, where there are no social facilities at all. The cafes of the Left Bank, so picturesque for the three-day tourist, look far different to the French student who must pay for the privilege of sitting there to meet his friends. He cannot meet them in the library for—by American university standards—there is no library, but only a dank, crowded hall without the current books much less a comfortable place to sit while you read them. And it is difficult for him to meet his friends between lectures. For if the student is not seated in the lecture hall an hour or so in advance, he may have to sit on the floor or stand in the door. In Paris, it is not unusual for students to live in ill-lighted attics or basements which few American institutions would use for piling trash.

If American students complain of lack of democracy and lack of opportunity for student participation, let them read the sign, yellowed with age, at the entrance to the Sorbonne, warning that to use these premises for political discussions is illegal. Or, let them take time out from student councils and committees and sit-ins to visit the great Universities of Germany or Japan. There the standoffish Herr Doktor Professor rules the roost.

The sober fact is that our system of colleges and universities is without equal. At least seventy-five of our Universities and at least five hundred of our four-year colleges provide a total educational opportunity rivaled by only a few institutions elsewhere in the world.

How, then, can we explain the current national psychosis—of apology for our higher education? How can we explain the spectacle—which now begins to have the uniformity and regularity of a folk-ritual? Whenever a rock is thrown, a sit-in is staged, or knives or guns are brandished on campus (by persons who may or may not be students), we hear from many professors, from nearly all deans and college presidents, and from too many half-informed public figures, a chorus sung in unison. The tune may vary, but the words are always the same: "Reforms-Long-Overdue!" The chorus is recited with the self-righteousness of a pledge of allegiance and with the solemn orthodoxy of a national anthem.

Tonight I will not try to talk about the deeper forces and motives that have given a few of our students their myopia, and have brought them to this pitch of irrationality. I will not talk about the increasing conspicuousness of dissent, the increasing temptations of our ever-multiplying media to dramatize and advertise and spectacularize the most violent acts and to make heroes of dyspeptics and psychotics. Nor will I talk about how this tendency of our technology

has been reinforced by many irresponsible newspaper editors, radio commentators, and television programmers. I will not talk about the new Sociology of self-denigration, about the vulgarization of the social sciences so that people who consider themselves up-to-date and well-informed like to think of our whole country as a nation of racist, waste-making, hidden-persuading, Madison-Avenue, organization men—a power-élite working in executive suites and (with their status-seeking wives) inhabiting a child-centered Suburban Wasteland. Nor will I talk about the deeper tendencies in American education, in American religion, or in the American family, which have pushed out of vision the continuity of our past. Nor will I trace the movements which have displaced "history" by "social studies" and which have replaced the narrative of achievements, the study of institutions, the excitement of great men and great events by a dreary focus on "issues" and "problems." Nor will I try to explain the extraordinary feat by which the whole American past—a great chronicle of the cooperative adventure of varied peoples—has come to be presented to more and more students as only so many centuries of Excedrin headaches.

Here in the United States today the crucial problems of higher education come from the very fact that till now we have been so spectacularly democratic. Relentlessly insisting that every American is entitled, as his birthright, to all the education that his native talents equip him for, we have pushed toward the outer limits of the real world. We begin to believe that all Americans, when they reach the proper age, are by definition equally qualified to profit from a higher education, and that similarly all these Americans when they reach the usual age of college-graduation are then *ex hypothesi* entitled to a diploma. The right to a diploma becomes equated with the right to vote.

It is important to remember that we come to this bizarre way of thinking through our democratic faith. And we are actually strengthened in our fantastic expectations by our real success in developing an egalitarian society. Our traditional optimism and our wealth have nourished our charitable desire to give Everybody Everything. Because we do know in our democratic hearts that Everybody is as good as Everybody else. But certain problems arise when the Good Thing that we want to give to Everybody is a higher education. This is a painful Democratic Paradox. We must now face it if we are to have any system of higher education at all.

While a democratic society must be ruthless in treating all citizens as equal before the law, while republican government depends on willingness to acquiesce in the decisions of the majority constitutionally expressed, the rules of the world of learning are quite different. The claim of an idea or a fact to a hearing cannot be decided by majority-vote and dare not be decided by force.

If Universities are to serve a democratic society, if our democratic society is to survive against totalitarian governments, we must not merely recognize, but must actually preserve and treasure this paradox. The corruption of learning in totalitarian countries is itself oddly enough an example of what happens when "democracy"—the rule of the majority will—is allowed to govern teaching and research in universities. The fact that a majority of the German people favored Nazism and believe the Aryan Myth—this did not make Nazism one whit better as a governing principle in universities. The fact that the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party was probably supported by a majority of the populace when in 1948 they enacted the genetics of Lysenko into university gospel for universities—this did not make it one iota better as science. Our own American universities have again and again profited from the coming of refugee

scholars, who managed to escape petty tyrants or labor camps or gas chambers, where the "majority" view of their former society would have sent them, and in which their "Aryan" or otherwise orthodox colleagues acquiesced.

The university must be a place of respect for and preference for intellectual superiority. Not for superiority in wealth, in ancestry, in political influence, and surely not in race—white or black. Within the universities, then, White Racism and Black Brahmanism, and every other kind of non-intellectual exceptionalism, is a cancer.

In the university all men are not equal. Those better endowed or better equipped intellectually must be preferred in admission, and preferred in recognition. The teacher-student relationship, too, must be governed by this fact. If the teacher does not have more knowledge or intellectual skill than the student, then the student is wasting his time; if he does, then in the intellectual relationship they are not quite equal. If we give in to the armed demands of militants to admit persons to university because of their race, their poverty, their illiteracy, or any other non-intellectual distinctions, our universities can no longer serve all of us—or any of us. If any ill-informed person can receive the imprimatur of the university because a bomb will explode if he does not, the university has begun to cease to be a university.

Can we reward intellectual mediocrity and inferiority (whether due to heredity or environment or lack of opportunity) and still expect to produce intellectual excellence? Of course it is our democratic duty to open the chances for all Americans—regardless of race, creed, or sex—fully to develop their talents. But it is also our democratic duty not to debase our intellectual life or to corrupt the sources of our knowledge. Our national prosperity and even our national survival depends on our ability to enlist our best geniuses and our ablest minds in the service of all of us. If we are not at least as ruthless in preferring intellectual excellence as we are in enforcing equality before the law, it will not be long before we will not have any society in which the rich or the poor, the equal or the unequal can survive, much less prosper.

It has sometimes been considered an admirable American democratic foible to give prizes and titles to everybody. The German and Swiss and French officers who came to serve with us in the American Revolution were astonished that the Continental Army had so few privates. They were advised to address everybody as "captain" until the contrary was proven. We have shown the same weakness when it has come to college degrees. Bliss Perry, after forty years of teaching at Williams, Princeton, and Harvard, once proposed that the only way to solve the democratic dilemma in American colleges was to award the Bachelor's Degree to all Americans at birth.

The proverbial willingness of some of our colleges to award degrees for good fellowship or athletic prowess, once considered hilarious, is no longer even funny. Nowadays a nation cannot survive, much less hold world leadership, if it does not keep moving on the frontiers of knowledge. Recently, one of our sharpest critics, the French journalist J. J. Servan-Schreiber in his *American Challenge* tried to awaken the peoples of Europe by showing how American leadership grew out of our superiority in knowledge and in organization. And these, he explained, were a long-term product of our system of higher education. We would do well to take his words seriously.

The intellectual resources of any nation are limited. Superior talents are scarce in all times and places. They must be sifted and treasured and nurtured. For Technology is ruthlessly democratic. She has no special

respect for minorities. She knows nothing but competence. An atomic reactor is no better run because it is run by a person whose skin is white or black. This is what Jefferson meant when he urged that the survival of our society might depend on our ability to discover and to nurture our "natural aristocracy." An equalitarian society, to be strong, must have institutions of higher learning which give due respect to superior knowledge and superior talents. Yet our colleges and universities must remain integral with our whole democratic society. We have long since abolished hereditary titles, benefit of clergy, the buying and selling of offices, and the notion that learned men are a law unto themselves. But now, under the shibboleth of reform and under cover of "equality" we hear the claim that student militants and black militants are a law unto themselves. They claim for themselves the privileges we have long since denied to men of wealth, men of "good family," to the clergy, or to any other special group. Our overprivileged militants, when they claim for their unlettered selves the privileges of the learned clerks, would take us back to the middle ages. They claim exemption from the rules of our society against robbery, trespass, mayhem, false imprisonment, arson, blackmail, and murder. These student militants and "black" militants—for all their talk of "equality" and "the future"—are our most unashamed claimants of special privilege. They are our reactionaries.

As a historian I cannot deny that history shows that violence has its uses. But was there ever an example of an educational institution improved by acts of violence, of libraries improved by the burning of books or card catalogues, or of educational processes improved by paralysis? When did educational leaders gain respect by surrendering their institutions to those who would destroy them?

What sensible person can deny that our colleges and universities can be improved? But who will say that they can be improved if they cease to be arenas of rational discussion? To hand over university-government, or any part of it, to those persons (students or non-students, white or black) who condemn the rational processes which alone justify a university—this can only be the first step of chaos. This is what recently happened at Cornell and at Harvard—to their shame, and ours.

We can all be happy to see the disappearance from the calendar of living folk-figures of the once-familiar Uncle Tom. That shuffling, "Yassuh-Boss" character will not be missed. But we must be just as unhappy to see him replaced by a new American folk-figure, now becoming all-too-familiar. He is the "Professor Tom." His moral fault is worse than that of the old Uncle Tom. The old Uncle Tom at least did not have the advantages of education nor the power or dignity of any position of authority. And, to Harriet Beecher Stowe, at least, he had the dignity of the Christ-like lover of his enemies, willing to suffer so that others might be saved. But our Professor Tom is cut from another cloth. If he suffers, it is not from courage but from weakness. If he fails his is a failure not only of personal integrity, but of leadership.

Professor Tom is running scared. The slightest show of force, or even a threat of a threat of force is enough to make him quake, and then add a few more militants to his ad hoc committee.

But just as the old Uncle Tom was indignity to all of us, so the new Professor Tom symbolizes a moral weakness that can corrupt us all. Professors who believe in the mission of their universities, who believe in the need for knowledge and rational discussion among men, cannot become Professor Tom's. Students who want an education will not want to be taught by Professor Tom's.

Democracies are seldom murdered. More often they commit suicide. A democratic society cannot be destroyed except with the collaboration of its victims. In our time we can see a foreshadowing of this collaboration in the widespread tendency to Spiritual Appeasement. This will not bring "Peace in our Time"—or in any time. The forces of unreason cannot be conciliated by telling the Nazis within that they are half-right, or by giving them an "equal voice." The Golden Mean, despite current claims to the contrary, is not a policy halfway between right and wrong. No assertion becomes more right or more rational because it is supported by threats. Spiritual Appeasement is the disease of those who lack faith in themselves, in their institutions, and in the struggle to make all men fully human. The antidote is not hate: It is faith, and pride.

RETURN OF BLACK MILITANT LEADER

HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I noted with deep concern the recent return to the United States of black militant leader Robert Franklin Williams, who has been a fugitive for the past 8 years from kidnapping charges growing out of a racial incident in Monroe, N.C. Since fleeing from the United States in 1961, Williams has spent the bulk of his time in the hostile countries of Cuba, Communist China, and North Vietnam. While in Cuba, Williams broadcasted regularly over Fidel Castro's "Radio Dixie" encouraging the American Negro community to foment unrest and to take part in riots and uprisings. One of the most vicious instruments utilized by Williams in his propaganda attacks on the United States has been "The Crusader," a newsletter published by Williams in Communist China. As an example of this man's propensity for violence, I would like to call to your attention remarks made by Williams in the summer 1969, issue of "The Crusader." On page 19 of this issue, Williams in openly advocating urban guerrilla warfare and street fighting, stated:

This is the era of extended communications, exposed pipelines, arteries, inflammable cities, a highly sensitive and complicated, but essential, industrial complex. This is the era of the match, the molotov cocktail, the slingshot with steel pellets, the plastic bomb, the sniper's rifle, the hacksaw and a host of other highly destructive weapons that are readily available.

Recent newspaper articles reported that upon his arrival in Detroit on September 12, 1969, Williams, president of the Republic of New Africa, a black militant group which demands possession of six Southern States for a Negro republic, was given a hero's welcome by over 100 members of the Black Legion, the paramilitary arm of the Republic of New Africa. These followers attired in black fatigue uniforms with leopard-skin epaulets and black berets gave a rousing cheer when Williams stepped off the plane.

How important and dangerous are Williams and his followers? This question cannot be considered merely ac-

ademically in view of the overt violence and revolutionary tactics employed by this band of militants. In addition, Williams' contacts with representatives of hostile countries serves to increase the potential for violence by giving inspiration, encouragement, and support to the revolutionary aims, doctrines, and activities of black extremists in this country. In view of this, we must certainly look upon Williams and his cohorts as a present and potential threat to our society and its institutions.

It is my hope that Negro citizens will continue to follow the lead of the responsible leaders of the civil rights movement, who have repeatedly warned of the misfortunes of violence. It is my hope that Negro citizens will recognize the truly pernicious nature of Williams' doctrines, which would usher in an era of catastrophe for all. He and his fellow malcontents must be isolated and defused.

DEATH OF FRANCIS J. BEATON, IMMEDIATE PAST COMMANDER, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the sudden and unexpected passing of the late Francis J. Beaton of Fargo, N. Dak., immediate past national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, has shocked and saddened me and his hundreds of other friends and admirers.

We North Dakotans were very proud of Francis, not only because he rose to the highest office in this outstanding veterans organization, but for his many other accomplishments and virtues. He was deeply devoted to his fellow man, and particularly to finding ways to be of assistance to disabled veterans and their families. There was never a more intense and dedicated patriot than Francis Beaton.

The September issue of the Disabled American Veterans Magazine carried an editorial tribute to Francis Beaton. It is a beautiful and moving article that reflects the high esteem held for Francis by all he came in contact with. He is greatly missed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN MEMORIAM: FRANCIS J. BEATON

When God's hand touched the heart of our beloved friend and Past National Commander, Francis J. Beaton, June 28, 1969, He healed it forever. And from his earthly work to his rest and reward, Comrade Beaton touched profoundly every heart among the Disabled American Veterans and a great company beyond, to whom the cause and succor of the disabled are sacred. The testimony of hundreds of friends was evidenced when they gathered in Fargo, North Dakota, for the last rites in the Church of the Nativity. While hundreds of others sent bouquets of flowers, of bud and bloom, from God's natural garden, each sent a prayer-offering to

God that Francis might enjoy the spiritual garden of love created by the benevolent love of God.

Not yet can we measure the meaning of his withdrawal from us, because, for so many years his life was an unending stream of devotion toward his fellowmen and country. The fifty-seven months in the Army during World War II and the wounds he received in the Battle of the Bulge are pictures of courage. The unselfish stream of courage and love flowed freely and joyously in many directions. But we know that his cup, which overflowed toward others, will nurture the growth of love for all mankind. In this far-reaching influence, his devotional life for others becomes his true monument among us, a cairn of remembrance of his sheer love for others and solid faith which need no eulogistic inscription from any engraver's hand.

Those friends who lived close to him will remember his individual courage, toil, and struggle in life. By his penetrating insight into the deeper needs of the disabled and the world in which he labored, he relied solely for competent guidance upon the school of experience he found in following those precepts which has created America's greatness as a nation.

His intense feeling for the disabled veteran is best seen by the fact that he never lost his interest in needs of the lowest and highest among mankind, never reached finality in his researches, and never ceased to be a learner of life. The stimulus of his early training was largely in his openness and freshness of mind and his love of God, family, and country. It was through his love for his fellowman that he found the expression of tireless energy to the widow, orphan, and dependents both in his community and across the nation. The faith in our nation counted so greatly in the influence he exerted that men had unbounded faith in his veracity and knew that his mature conclusions were uttered without reserve or fear.

By his combination of zeal of a visionary, judgment of a businessman, and persistence in finding men for the myriad tasks he faced within the DAV from chapter to national levels, he willingly persuaded men to share in the herculean tasks, which gave impetus to the fulfillment of the needs of the disabled.

We need no tape recorder or echo to enable us to listen to his voice. That eager, yet judicial, voice made up a presence never to be forgotten. When he stood before a chapter installation of officers, when he lifted up a sincere pledge during a meeting, or while he was seated in an airplane, counseling with another, one could readily hear a voice that had heard another say, "Know before whom thou standest." Surely he knew with what the Creator may endow man's spirit and what divine gifts would belong to man if mankind would recognize before whom it stood. This was the voice he sought, in his natural way, to share with others.

He honored his father and mother in the home in which he grew up. Love, truth, kindness, and high nobility permeated that home.

Deep as were his roots in his faith also were his roots in the community called Fargo. He knew the meaning of the plowman stooped over the kindly black earth as he prepared the soil for seedtime and harvest. Faith and hope were his companions as he scattered the seeds within the furrows. And as the plow was the creative quill inscribing its theme in the soil, so was his patriotic spirit the impulse which constantly anointed his heart. He thus could see the glow of expectancy emerge from soil and heart alike. Cultivating each through diligence, prayer, faith, and hope, he shared the fruits of his labors and his faith with his neighbor and his fellowman.

Often he said, in essence, that man should not cease sowing because he is denied the

fruits, for plow and plowman, like body and soul, must unite into a continuing covenant to enrich mankind.

It was natural that one such as he should seek ways of serving his fellowman. The rejected disabled felt the strength of his hand and heart.

The people in small offices knew the broadness of his smile. The struggling DAV chapter knew the breadth of his encouragement. And the circle of love for his community of comrades across America was woven through thoughtfulness and understanding. These were made manifest because he knew and shared the common denominator which binds them together.

Surely it is most fitting to say to his beloved wife, to his children, and to all members of his warmly-knit family: "Be strong and of good courage." Hold fast to your beautiful memories and therein find solace. Hold fast to the ideas he bequeathed to you and therein find consolation. Hold fast to the ideals that were so nobly his and so fully yours. Therein you will find strength, guidance, and understanding throughout your lives. Hold fast his loyal love for God and country. Therein will you fulfill the hope he found as a reality with the God who is Father of all."

Francis Beaton was a good man in the highest meaning of the word. Transparent and unselfish courtesy, beneficent firmness in the right, fidelity, and fear of and love for God—these characterized him—these linger now in memory.

Yes, diminished as we are by the death of any man, we are here joined in heart in a renewal of dedication toward the heritage of the ideals he set forth by precept and example—all to the glory of God. We are indeed diminished by his death even as our lives were enlarged by him. His portrait will long hang in the hallowed hall of the Disabled American Veterans.

ADMINISTRATIVE DISCHARGE REFORM

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, over the past 20 years, military justice has kept pace with the most enlightened views of the science of jurisprudence. With enactment of the Uniform Code of Military Justice in 1950 and again with the Military Justice Act of 1968, Congress has sought to insure that members of the Armed Forces do receive similar or better protection at the hands of their military superiors than before a civilian court of law. No country can now boast of a better code of military justice than the United States, and I hope that we will always be able to make this claim.

As long as the Armed Forces have existed, there has been, in addition to courts-martial, a system of administrative actions through boards of officers whereby persons could be "administratively discharged" for cause. Initially, this system was designed to supplement the military justice system by providing a method of separating from the Armed Forces individuals of dubious character who could not be court-martialed for one reason or another, but who clearly were unsuited or unfit for further military service. Until the end of World War II,

however, these administrative discharge procedures were little used. Their use gained ascendancy following enactment of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. A study conducted by the Judge Advocate General of the Air Force in 1960 revealed that many commanders were using administrative discharge procedures to avoid the rigorous procedures of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Use of these procedures was facilitated by the fact that they are a creature not of statute but of regulation. The statute authorizing the administrative discharge system states simply that regular enlisted members of an armed force may be discharged before the expiration of their term of service as prescribed by the Secretary concerned.

If the Armed Forces were like other branches of the Government or private employers, the fact that no statutory authority exists for an individual's separation from "employment" would not be a cause for worry because an employer can normally fire his employee for any reason whatever. However, the Armed Forces are not like other employers, and for a very good reason. Employers do not normally give discharge certificates, and do not characterize the certificate to describe the employee's service. The Armed Forces, on the other hand, have an elaborate system of discharge characterization, whereby discharges under honorable conditions—honorable and general discharges—under other than honorable conditions—administratively awarded undesirable discharges—and punitive—bad conduct discharges and dishonorable discharges awarded by court-martial—may be awarded. Furthermore, the award of an unfavorable discharge has serious effects on an individual's future life. Veterans' benefits are generally conditioned on the award of a discharge under honorable conditions, and many State benefits are conditioned on the award of an honorable discharge. Employers are frequently reluctant to hire individuals possessing less than honorable discharges. These adverse effects flowing from less than honorable discharges create the problem because an administrative discharge system that does not give some form of protection to the rights of an individual subject to an adverse discharge, deprives him of his constitutional rights.

Congress has been aware of the problems related to administrative discharges for the past 7 years. The Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, under the able leadership of Senator SAM J. ERVIN, JR., Democrat of North Carolina, has twice held detailed hearings into the nature of and reform of the administrative discharge system. Senator ERVIN has introduced a number of detailed bills purporting to reform the administrative discharge system. The Department of Defense has also tried to reform the system and has accomplished a number of salutary changes. Foremost among these changes accomplished by the Department of Defense is a guarantee of the right to counsel in cases involving unfitness. Despite these administrative changes, certain reforms can only be accomplished by statute.

Both the nature of the administrative discharge system and the need for its improvement were graphically highlighted last year by the American Bar Association at its annual convention. The American Bar Association adopted a set of resolutions setting forth what it considered to be the "minimum standards of due process" that should be accorded in administrative discharge procedure wherein a discharge under other than honorable conditions could result, and urged the enactment of legislation incorporating these standards. Among these standards are the following: Right to legally qualified counsel, right to confront adverse witnesses, right to require that the Government carry the burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence, right to appeal to an impartial review board, protection against double jeopardy, and application of the rules of evidence applied in the Federal courts. These standards may sound similar to those accorded in a criminal trial or court-martial. However, it is precisely because the undesirable discharge has effects similar to a bad conduct discharge without the protection accorded by a court-martial that these standards of due process are necessary.

Because I believe that the American Bar Association standards are appropriate and because I believe that reform of the administrative discharge system is necessary, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 943, in the House of Representatives incorporating these minimum standards. The Department of Defense has recognized the necessity for reform and has indicated its support for my bill. It is my belief that this bill can be enacted into law in this session of Congress, and I intend to press for its passage. With the enactment of this bill, our servicemen will receive first class justice not only before a court-martial but in administrative discharge proceedings as well. Indeed, passage of this bill will serve to demonstrate to all our servicemen that our debt of gratitude for their sacrifices is ever continuing, and that charges of drum-head justice are indeed a thing of the past.

LAND REFORM IN SOUTH VIETNAM

HON. ALAN CRANSTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, land reform, a long overdue and vitally necessary program, is again an issue in South Vietnam. President Thieu favors land reform, but faces serious opposition from legislators in the lower House.

An excellent article published in the Christian Science Monitor of September 24, 1969, reports that if the Thieu government is able to enact this program by the end of the year, it "will have taken one of the most important forward steps possible in its struggle for a political majority."

Since the mid-1950's, many Vietnamese and Americans have urged the passage of land reform. The present pro-

positional places a 30-hectares limitation on what each landholder can possess. However, as George W. Ashworth reports in the article, the revised bill of South Vietnam's lower House undermines progress by allowing landlords to—

Keep 15 hectares above what they till in the delta and the highlands and 5 hectares in the central lowlands. In addition, up to 15 hectares of "ancestor worship" land could be retained. Priority would go to "legal" occupants, something that would be virtually impossible to determine with the vicissitudes of war, and which would lend itself to shady dealings.

Mr. Ashworth points out that this retention plan would be unworkable. As now outlined, this kind of determination to prevent social and economic progress by the large landholding class, supported by the legislator, would be an obstacle to progress.

But if a workable bill is produced—

The Saigon Government could have one of the most potent weapons possible in its political confrontation with the Communists.

As one source put it: "It will be very hard to get rid of any government that has allowed the people to own their own land."

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORKABLE LAND REFORM WITHIN SAIGON'S REACH?

(By George W. Ashworth)

SAIGON.—South Vietnam could have a workable land-reform program by the end of the year.

If so, many political analysts here believe, the Thieu government will have taken one of the most important forward steps possible in its struggle for a political majority.

Earlier this month, the lower house gave approval to a comprehensive land-reform bill. But the few changes instituted by the House in President Thieu's proposed program had the probable effect of making the proposal unworkable.

The House action was a sharp blow to South Vietnamese who have been working steadfastly for passage of the far-reaching land-reform bill.

But now, able to view the House vote in retrospect, many Vietnamese and Americans say that odds favor passage of a workable program in time for the December-to-February harvest.

Their reasoning goes like this:

The House defeat of the Thieu proposal is seen less as a rejection of broad land reform than as a political rebuff to Mr. Thieu.

The amendments were demanded by a combination of disgruntled landlords, those who thought Mr. Thieu was usurping assembly prerogatives in proposing such a vast program, and those who just wanted to oppose Mr. Thieu for other reasons. Opposition was helped by Mr. Thieu's reluctance to press for support in the crucial consideration period.

The Senate, which is not so jealous of its prerogatives as the lower House, is normally more responsive to Mr. Thieu's wishes.

The combination of support by a Senate majority, plus anticipated hard campaigning for the proposals by the President, should lead the Senate to bring the bill much closer to the original form.

Mr. Thieu could then exercise his executive prerogatives to amend the bill still further, if necessary, to get precisely what he and the Agriculture and Land Reform Ministry want.

To reject Mr. Thieu's amendments, the two houses would have to muster a two-

thirds vote against the bill, seen here as an unlikely eventuality.

Once land reform is approved, officials foresee the village committees set up to give "land to the tiller" as being inundated with applications. The ensuing paper work morass could slow distribution of the land well past the harvest time, depriving the potential land holder of full ownership of this year's crop.

Consequently, some Americans have suggested that President Thieu could issue a decree that all applications would have conditional approval immediately, except where there are conflicts.

President Nixon heartily endorsed the land-reform proposal at the June Midway conference, and he reiterated his support upon his visit here in July.

The Americans have committed \$10 million immediately upon inauguration of the program, which would cost an estimated \$400 million. The Americans would plan on giving another \$30 million later.

RICE BONDS SUGGESTED

But some American land-reform experts have argued that 10 percent support is not enough. Instead, they have told United States officials, the government should be willing to pay half or \$200 million, preferably in commodities, to ensure steady and successful progress of the difficult program.

To avoid inflation, some experts have suggested that the government give bonds for all but about 20 percent of the purchase costs. These would be negotiable inflation-proof rice bonds.

Roy Prosterman, a professor of law at the University of Washington and specialist on Southeast Asian land reform, was in Vietnam recently to look into current progress.

"This program is of such fundamental importance that we would be very remiss if we were not to give full financial backing," he said.

But, Professor Prosterman added, "by the same token, this is a crucial test of the maturity of the Vietnamese political process. If, despite promises of full United States backing, the Vietnamese are unwilling or unable to take this essential measure of self-help, then I think there has to be a basic reexamination of whether we can or should furnish a single additional life or a single additional dollar to the conflict."

Mr. Prosterman pointed out that in 1954 President Eisenhower had made it clear to the South Vietnamese that land reform was one of the conditions of United States support.

CONCLUSION DRAWN

He concluded: "A great deal of our trouble has been the willingness to give the aid and not insist on the reforms."

Land reform was accomplished to some degree under the late President Diem, but the present program is vastly more comprehensive than those early beginnings.

One of the more revolutionary aspects of the current program is the concept of giving, not selling, land to the tiller. Americans and Vietnamese believe that revolutionary aspect is essential in the present situation.

These reasons are cited:

If forced to pay a fair price, the peasants would have to give up perhaps a quarter of the crop for 12 years. Coupled with taxes and other costs of ownership, this could make them less well off than they are now with landlords taking roughly a half of the gross crops in many instances.

Under the present situation, there is no adequate method to collect payments. Corruption would be promoted, and the peasant would be the certain loser with little net gain for the government in funds, and possibly great losses in support.

COMPETITION ASSESSED

The tillers have already paid a great deal for the use of the land. Some experts say

many have paid half again the legal rate for years.

In order to compete with the Viet Cong, who are giving the land to the peasants in areas they control with an eye to future collectivization, the government should give the land with no strings attached.

The South Vietnamese Government believes its program can compete quite successfully against that of the Viet Cong.

First, the gift is permanent.

Second, government land taxes to be levied on new owners after a year of grace will be far less than present taxes imposed by the Viet Cong.

Third, back rents are not to be collected from newly liberated lands.

And finally, landlords will be fairly compensated.

In all, the program is destined to give 1-3 hectares of land each to possibly one million landless tenants, or perhaps to 80 percent of those who, surveys have indicated, would like to own their own land.

The present land-reform bill approved by the House could cut by at least one-half the number benefiting from the program.

WHAT LAND TO KEEP

Mr. Thieu had called for landlords to be able to keep only land they tilled themselves, up to a total of 30 hectares. Under the House bill, landlords could keep 15 hectares above what they till in the delta and the highlands and 5 hectares in the central lowlands.

In addition, up to 15 hectares of "ancestor worship" land could be retained. Priority would go to "legal" occupants, something that would be virtually impossible to determine with the vicissitudes of war, and which would lend itself to shady dealings.

The House retention plan would make the program unworkable, sources believe, as it would open the way for a great deal of maneuvering by shifty landlords and bribed officials.

As for "ancestor worship" land of such a large size, that could be easily abused. There have been some reports of zealous landlords hastily shifting their ancestral graves into more productive land areas.

If these problems can be surmounted, and a workable bill produced, sources say, the Saigon government could have one of the most potent weapons possible in its political confrontation with the Communists.

As one source put it: "It will be very hard to get rid of any government that has allowed the people to own their own land."

THE SCHOOL OF THE OZARKS

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years, I have been intensely interested in the growth and development of the School of the Ozarks, located at Point Lookout, Mo.

Since 1917, this school has grown from a one-room log cabin to a modern and well-planned campus.

I have served a tenure as physician to the students.

I have participated in the dedication of many of their buildings on campus.

I have observed the college become accredited by the North Central Association before it even graduated its first 4-year class.

It is obvious, that my pride in this fine school is boundless.

Recently, a former next door neighbor of mine, Dickson Terry, now living in St. Louis, Mo., wrote a feature story about this unique school for the publication, *The Midwest Motorist*. It was so well done, and so enlightening, that I have asked permission to have it printed in the *RECORD* so that others may make themselves aware of the many fine accomplishments of this institution.

The article follows:

[FROM THE MIDWEST MOTORIST]

(By Dickson Terry)

For a school to become a tourist attraction is somewhat out of the ordinary, but then, so is the school.

It is called the School of the Ozarks, and it is situated on a 1,200-acre campus which overlooks Lake Taneycomo on the southern edge of the famed Shepherd of the Hills country.

It has been there since 1906, when it was a one-building school set up to give youngsters of the hill country a high school education—if they were willing to work for it.

Today it is a fully accredited college with 800 students, and, as it has grown in size, it has grown also in fame. In recent years, it has become a nationally known institution, unique in its operation. But whereas today it offers a college education, its basic principle remains the same. It is open only to boys and girls who have to, and are willing, to work for it. Anyone who can pay his way through college need not apply.

The school has always had a trickling of visitors through the years, and they have always been welcome. They are still welcome, but since the place began to achieve national fame through magazine and newspaper articles a decade or so ago, the trickle has turned into a flood.

"Last year we had more than 50,000 visitors," said Dr. M. Graham Clark, dynamic president of the school, who has been largely responsible both for its fame and growth, "and the number keeps growing every year. It's now a part of the Ozarks tour."

STUDENTS ARE GUIDES

This might have presented something of a problem to some schools, but Dr. Clark, running true to type, has merely turned the tide of visitors to the school's advantage.

First he equipped groups of male students with smart maroon blazers, decorated with the school's seal, and they became guides to show visitors around. This provided another avenue of employment for students.

Then last year he completed a huge new facility near the main gate of the school called "Friendship House." It contains a modern, rather plush dining room for visitors, another source of revenue for the school, and it also has a large weaving room and gift shop. Here visitors can buy the attractive woven goods which girl students turn out on the 20 looms, or the jellies and jams put up at the school's factory, or various souvenirs made at the school.

This year the school has added a miniature electric train, once a ski train at Lake Placid, which will take visitors the eighth of a mile from the main gate to the campus proper. There they are met by young girl students, also smartly turned out in school blazers, who will take them for a tour of the ground and buildings.

This, too, is good business.

"You'd be surprised," said Dr. Clark, "how many of these tourists will go home and mail us a check to help keep the school going."

FOUNDED BY MISSIONARY

The school has more than 100 buildings now, and is on a fairly firm financial basis, but it wasn't always that way. At the turn of the century, James Forsyth, a young home missionary for the Presbyterian church, was assigned to the Ozark mountains in south-

west Missouri. He found a region almost as remote as a foreign country. Roads were passable only on horseback, and the people lived unto themselves. Some of the youngsters got elementary schooling a few months of the year in log schools. High school was looked upon as something unattainable.

Forsyth appealed to the heads of his church. With their help, and with nickels and dimes donated by the hill people themselves, he built the first one-room School of the Ozarks at Forsyth, Mo. The youngsters came on foot and on horseback. Most of them had never seen running water in a home, not to mention electric lights. To help pay for their education, they brought hams, sides of bacon, and home-canned vegetables.

The school opened in 1906, but so few of its students were equipped for a high school education that the first class wasn't graduated until 1913.

The school burned in 1915. It was moved to a one-time clubhouse on Point Lookout where it has been since. The first tuition-earning projects at the school were gardening and canning, and the Rev. Dr. R. M. Good, now president emeritus, recalls too well the long periods when students and faculty had little to eat except the vegetables they grew themselves, with meat once a week.

A group of club women visited the school and observed that the students had no milk to drink. They donated a cow. That was the beginning of a dairy herd which is today graded one of the best in the Midwest.

In 1946, Dr. Clark left a job as an insurance executive in Atlanta to come to the school as assistant administrator. He became president in 1952. By this time roads and highways had penetrated the Ozarks, and most youngsters were able to go to nearby towns to high school. The School of the Ozarks changed its curriculum to include the last two years of high school and two years of junior college. In 1967, with no further need for a high school, the School of the Ozarks became a four-year, liberal arts college.

TOURIST ATTRACTION

Tourists are surprised, even amazed, at what they see at the place. On the tour they learn what makes the wheels turn. To pay for their tuition, room, and board, students are required to work 540 hours during the summer and at least 22 hours a week while school is in session.

The students farm 600 acres, process their own meat and dairy products. They work in the canning factory, the construction department (virtually all new construction work is done by students under supervision of skilled carpenters and stonemasons), the power plant, the printing plant, or the weaving room. They also do their own plumbing, sheet metal work, and engineering.

Visitors can see the new, modern library with 300,000 volumes and hundreds of periodicals—all new.

They can see the Williams Memorial Chapel, an inspiring building which would be a credit to any campus. They can visit the Jones Learning Center which contains a completely equipped modern theater where students present classical and modern plays.

THE FOSTER MUSEUM

And finally there is the museum. It is called the Ralph Foster Museum, and for sheer heterogeneity there is nothing like it this side of the Smithsonian Institution. Where else under one roof, would you find General Grant's rollout desk, the late Cicero Weaver's spinning bow tie beloved of vaudeville fans for a generation, and a 1931 Rolls Royce in mint condition?

The museum was started when Foster, who owns radio and television stations in Springfield, Mo., donated to the school his life-long collection of Indian artifacts, 100,000 of them, ranging from tiny arrowheads which

would shoot down a sparrow to spears which would bring down a buffalo.

The students built a museum to house the collection, and since then the museum has been enlarged time after time to contain the many and varied objects which have come to the school from people all over the United States.

Gun collectors could spend a week in the place, drooling over the collection of more than 1,200 antique firearms, ranging from the Daniel Boone era through the Civil War, and both World Wars.

COLLECTIONS GALORE

The pistol collection starts with flintlocks and runs the gamut through cap and ball, derringers, and handsome dueling pistols inlaid with gold and silver. Included are pistols used by Bat Masterson, the Quantrills, the James boys, and the Dalton gang.

There are medieval arms and suits of armor, antique shackles and handcuffs used by law officers of the old West. A coin collection of 100,000 items, tens of thousands of old stock certificates and paper money of all denominations. There are collections of antique china and silver, a log cabin moved from the hills when Bull Shoals lake was formed, a Buddhist shrine, a seven-foot high stuffed grizzly bear, a two-headed calf (also stuffed, of course), as well as stuffed moose, bison and caribou.

A sea shell collection contains hundreds of specimens, as does the butterfly collection. There are hundreds of mounted animal heads, a complete country store and barber shop of a century ago, and in addition to General Grant's desk there is the bed in which General Lyon died after the battle of Wilson's Creek.

What the visitors won't see at the school are beards, kookie clothes, or automobiles. The students have neither the time for dissection, nor the money for cars and expensive clothes. Social stratification is not a problem.

As Dr. Clark points out, the academic program is rigorous. The work program takes four hours of each day. Most students take part in at least one extracurricular activity. Add to this homework and eight hours of sleep, and the 24 hours of the day are heavily mortgaged.

A SON DIES IN VIETNAM

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, recently I received one of the most moving stories I have ever read. It is the poignant story of a mother and her family in my State of Arizona, who must go through the ordeal of burying a son who has been killed in Vietnam.

In the debate that roils from time to time in the Senate, we often forget that the issues we debate are issues that are ultimately reconciled only in human lives and fortunes.

Mrs. Roseanne Carter, has recorded for us the emotions of grief, helplessness, and pride bordering on anger, that overtook her and her family upon the loss of their son in Vietnam.

I have written to the Carter family with my inadequate expression of sympathy. One of the things which I told them is that Mrs. Carter's story helped me. In order that it might be of help to an even wider circle, I ask unanimous consent that her story, published in the

Chicago Tribune Sunday Magazine September 14, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"REJOICE NOT AGAINST ME, O MINE ENEMY: WHEN I FALL, I SHALL ARISE; WHEN I SIT IN DARKNESS, THE LORD SHALL BE A LIGHT UNTO ME"—MICAH 7:8

(By Roseanne Carter)

We were about half a block from home when I saw the khaki-colored car and the uniformed men. I began to feel a crawling numbness which slipped over my head and advanced steadily downward except as I could push it back by saying: "O no, Marsha, no. No, Marsha." My 17-year-old daughter was holding the baby, Paul, on the seat beside me. Lorri, Brian, and Roseanne Jr. in the back became very still. I thought I might miss the driveway or come into it too close and hit the fence again, but I didn't. I got out of the carryall. I looked at the concrete driveway and at the grass in our yard, then I looked at the street. The men were there and they were coming toward us.

I got the key out and opened our front door. The men followed the children inside. I went into the living room and sat down. The major said, "Is your husband at home?" I said, "He's at our store. Lorri, call your daddy." She dialed the number twice but couldn't seem to dial correctly. The sergeant made the call for her.

I said, "He's wounded, isn't he? Is it bad? How bad is it? He is wounded. What hospital is he in?" The major sat down on the couch. "He isn't wounded." I looked at the sergeant. He was crying.

I heard my husband come in the back door. The major said, "Mrs. Carter, it's my duty to inform you that your son, Jack David Carter, was killed by friendly artillery on 25 March 1969 in Quang Tri province while engaged in action against hostile forces." Jack had come into the living room. He said, "Honey, we knew this might happen." I said, "I didn't."

The major said, "Your son's service number was 2473062?" I got the form letter we had received giving us Jackie's Viet Nam address. "His number is 2473062." Brian, 11, who had been on the couch by the major, said, "My brother isn't dead, is he?" The major put his hand on Brian's shoulder. Jack said, "Is there a chance it might be a mistake?" The major said, "I don't think so."

The major told us all he knew, which had come in a telegram from Washington. He was patient, exhaustingly thoro, and he was calm. Such calculated calmness serves a purpose. There is much to be said for calmness in an emotionally charged situation. It steadies. And it has the effect of forcing the participants to use their reserves of civility. Faced with a marine doing his duty I was able even to feel a sense of reflected pride. My son had been part of that tough, capable tradition. And if I didn't bear up, they might think he hadn't been a good marine.

When the major and sergeant had gone my husband went to his office at the store. I hadn't wanted him to go. I hadn't understood why he left us. I was thinking of myself and not of his need to be alone. Shortly, I called Jack at the store. I said, "Please come home now." He said, "All right." After that we began to call people. We called everyone we could. It wasn't really just to let them know. It was like saying "Help!"

Shortly, I became consumed with a need to phone the girl Jackie had dated. I knew her last name started with a P or a T and we knew the street on which she lived. It took three hours to find the phone number, then I decided to go to her house and tell her myself. I wanted to be sure her parents were at home. I found the house and told her mother who cried for she had loved the

boy. Then I felt I had done as he would have wanted, so I left.

Early the next morning, a Sunday, Marsha and Lorri [aged 13] straightened the house. They worked quietly and quickly. Jack and I sat in the front yard. Friends came by. We were glad, eager to see them. Paul, the 4-month-old, danced on my lap, laughing at the breezes which tickled his nose, or at the inappropriate sun on the verberna or just because the world seemed a cheery place. I was holding the baby and developing a fantasy: Jackie David had exchanged dog tags with another marine for good luck. I could see the boys switching tags, laughing, chiding each other for their mutual superstition. The truth is that tho I didn't want any one's son to be dead, most of all I didn't want my son dead.

The major had said he would return at 1 p.m. Sunday to give us more details and to assist us in filling out various forms and in understanding the applicable benefits. We were anxious to talk to him. We wanted to ask the same questions again. We would be glad to see him. Because our son was a marine we had developed a fondness for the sight of marine dress.

The major came by after church and proceeded to be painstaking about the pertinent information. He answered our questions and shortly, but not with abruptness, took his leave. When he had gone we listened to FM or talked or stared out the windows. I bought a supply of frozen dinners at the store—five turkeys, five chickens, five meat loaves. Making a menu and shopping for needed items seemed impossible tasks. But I would have benefited had I had sufficient discipline at that moment to force myself. Discipline was called for. A discipline I would later dredge up, shake out, and activate in order to continue functioning.

Sunday morning we had received a telegram at our Scottsdale [Ariz.] home confirming all the major had told us on Saturday. On Monday we received a telegram which said our son's body would arrive in Phoenix at 6:15 p.m. Wednesday. We talked to the funeral director and to the major. They advised us not to meet his body. "The military casket is in a wooden crate," the major told us. "They unload it on the far side of the field." It seemed to me that this was wrong. That his body should be borne thru the airport, down the noisy, beige corridor and into the large waiting room with the fiery phoenix on its wall. To have him returned like that, unloaded in some dim undistinguished spot without anyone who loved him to oversee, to care about the handling of him, seemed shameful. But we didn't go. We didn't know our way around out there on the far side of the field. We imagined mishaps, hours of waiting, and that the funeral people might think we didn't trust them.

We went instead to the funeral home to wait until they had applied whatever additional cosmetic art might be called for. My husband's mother, executive housekeeper in a Florida hotel, had flown out. [Her boss made the arrangements and paid her fare. It was a good and desirable gift.] She stayed at home with the other children. I think now how difficult and tiring it must have been for her. If it was, she didn't let us know.

We waited at the funeral home and smoked too much. We were sitting on the gold satin couch in the front waiting room. I confessed to my husband that in the back of my mind I harbored the idea that the body would not be Jackie's. That we would know when we had seen the boy in the casket that our son was somewhere still alive. Jack said he had the same secret hope. Expression of that mutual hope did not enhance it, but had a depressing effect. I think we both realized that we were experiencing a common psychological phenomenon.

There in the front room of the funeral

home the numbness was slipping over me again. I had cried some each day since they told us. Each time I had stopped crying because of the hope. Now I began to be afraid. Not just in my mind, not just with a sinking stomach, but deep in the joints that hold my body together and inside the veins which seemed to relay the message to the muscles they service: "He's dead. It is him and he is dead."

Then it seemed I was poured full of lead. I could not move. If they came and said, "You may see the body now," I wouldn't be able to get up and go look at it. We listened for that whisper on the carpeting which signaled their coming, and we began not to see each other. We studied the marble-topped coffee table or the tear-drop chandelier. The sun was down, there were headlights in the street. The funeral director came down the hall. "You can see the body now."

The funeral home is beautiful but I resented it. I resented the lovely appointments, I resented the courtesy of the people who work there, I resented the box of dead people's glasses on a table at the end of the hall. We followed the funeral director down the hall. Inside a smallish room the blue metal casket with its chrome handles was on a pedestal. We walked slowly but certainly toward it tho in my mind I halted 100 times between the door and the coffin.

The upper half of the body was covered with glass. In San Francisco they had put on dress blues and white gloves. We looked at the face. It was his face. His hair needed cutting. The close "Nam" cut was overgrown. Jack said, "We'll have to have the glass removed." The funeral director said it would take a few minutes and for us to wait outside. Earlier we had decided that if his body was covered by glass we must ask to have it removed. We thought that if something of him were still alive in there it ought to have a chance to get out. I can't explain many of the things we thought and felt. But I can and do report them.

When we returned to the room the funeral director cautioned us not to touch the face for it had been rebuilt, also portions of the chest were not stable. Jack said, "We'd like to be alone with our son." When the funeral director had gone we studied the dead face more intently. We identified the scar in the right eyebrow caused by a motorcycle accident, the shape of his lips, the way hair above his forehead grew, leaning toward his left when it was too long, its straw color and fineness. Didn't I know the feel, the smell, the look of that head. Full of sweat or fresh from the bathtub. That face, waking or lost in sleep, the naturally arched brows above those round eyes, the straight fringe of his lashes above his narrow cheeks.

The odor of formaldehyde was overpowering. I touched one of the white gloved hands in the casket and drew away from the thick stiffness of it. My husband touched the chest of his son, his breast, his stomach, his upper legs, his fingers, his arms. "His right arm is off," Jack was crying. It was as tho he had said, "Our right arm is off. They've filled in our chest. Our nose has been patched together." Jack's inspection of our son was carried out as tho he needed to discover in what condition he might expect, at the next blinking of his eyes, to find himself.

I was thinking of how our son had been and feeling amazed that it could so suddenly come to this. Jackie could run and jump and climb and walk for miles; he could laugh hard, open jars, fix mall boxes; he could hunt and fish, row and swim, dive and duck, and play king of the mountain; he could trim Christmas trees, mow the lawn, sweep floors, drape the babies, fix refrigeration units, care for plants, handle horses, kiss me good-night and say, "I love you mother." The room was small and unvented. Formaldehyde fumes were in our eyes, our throats, our lungs, and on the clothes we

wore. I wanted to get the smell of it off me. But I wanted to get the smell of it off my son, too.

The funeral director came in. We were standing close to the body holding the rim of his casket. The funeral director stood by us for a moment, then he said sometimes it is difficult to decide whether or not to allow children to view the body of a dead relative. And that the studies have shown that it is best to allow children to see the body since later on there were likely to be fewer incidences of bizarre behavior related to the death, funeral, and burial. We had thought the younger children should not see their brother dead. That it would ease their minds, keep their remembrances bright if they were able to think of him only as he had been in life.

The funeral director said that the children would wonder, even as we had until we saw the body, whether it was Jackie David's in the coffin. And they might wonder whether he really was dead. If they doubted that, the burial would be intolerable for them. We thanked him and said that we would then have the children come to see their brother but keep the casket closed for public viewing. The funeral director wanted to put the glass back over the body. I put my hand on Jackie's chest and moved one brass button so that the insignia on it was straightened. My husband said, "We'll go for the children."

My mother-in-law and the children were waiting for us. Mother had them ready just in case. We drove back to the funeral home and went in. The baby was chewing on the collar of my dress and pulling my hair. I tried to stay close to all the children, my husband was by his mother. We jammed up at the door to the small room, hesitated, then moved ahead in a knot. At the casket no one cried. They looked, they searched the dead features. Each child in his turn studied the face and became resolved that it was Jackie David.

Our son's marine escort, a corporal, was on duty in the room. The corporal was a tall, midwestern boy who had served in Viet Nam. He was to stay with our son from 2 to 5 and from 7 to 9 p.m. He was having trouble finding a motel room. The funeral director said: "We have a little room out back. You can stay there." The corporal responded in a rush of words, "No sir, thank you very much, sir."

Those days between the arrival of the body and the burial seemed very long. At first it felt strange and sickening to be going so much to the funeral home. Then I noticed that I had become fond of going to the funeral home. Jackie David was there, wasn't he? On Thursday and Friday evening when everyone else had left, we opened the casket and had the glass removed. Mother and Jack and I and the children stood close around full of greeting, or praise, blessing or unsayable devotion. And we waited for that moment. How anxious we were for the last straggling guests who had seen only his picture on a stand above the coffin to leave so that we might be alone with him. We had quickly grown accustomed to the alterations in his features and had privately welcomed him back among us. The epitomy of love had been realized. No more shock or fear at the sight of his body. Our common affection had led us to accept and, accepting, to share in this experience with Jackie with whom we had shared years of happenings.

Fifty-seven baskets of flowers arrived. On Friday after the body had been moved into the chapel, I had arranged each of the new baskets according to color and relative height. Pure reds, stately gladioli, flanking the altar. Reds and whites on the platform. Whites and yellows to the right rear. Predominantly orange bunches to the right front, predominantly purples to the left front. Family roses at each end of the casket. More whites and yellows around the large

door into the chapel. I carried the stands to and fro. I alternated baskets. When these were balanced to my satisfaction I set about picking lint from the flag covering his coffin. This done, I began to concern myself with the condition of the polish on the podium. Then I sat down to cry because I hadn't furniture polish with me.

By early Saturday morning I had transferred my attention to counting names in the guest book, Jack had arrived at the funeral home earlier. He had tried to take pictures of the casket and flowers but none of them turned out as well as he hoped. When people began to arrive for the 10 a.m. services, we arranged ourselves in the front. Alice, our family friend, was near to help with Paul. Jack's face was weighted with grief. The children alternately stared and wept silently except for 3-year-old Roseanne who took the occasion as a celebration of the fact that Jackie was sleeping in the flowers. She chatted and pulled the white ribbons on her hat. She removed her gloves and tried to fill one with air so she could smash it. Failing that, contented herself with tripping from our pew to the one behind us where Alice and Lorri sat with Paul. When I turned to caution Roseanne I saw the chapel was full and there were people standing at the back.

The chaplain, a navy reserve officer, had visited us earlier. We had requested his use of the 34th psalm from verses 15, 18, and 21: "... the eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous, and His ears are open unto their cry ... the Lord is high unto them that are of a broken heart. ... Evil shall slay the wicked; and they that hate the righteous shall be desolate. ... " And verse 8 of Micah, chapter 7: "... Rejoice not against me, O mine enemy; when I fall, I shall arise; when I sit in darkness, the Lord shall be a light unto me." And we had asked the chaplain not to make any references to the idea that God giveth and God taketh away. We feel that the God who is love is not in any way responsible for the death of our son. We had talked about the idea that people tend to use the Diety as a catchall for the unspeakable or for those things with which they prefer not to cope. While it is true that God Almighty does not need Jack and Roseanne Carter to defend His integrity, it is also true that as honorable human beings we could not allow Him to be miscredited on our account. The chaplain, happy to please us, had not dissented.

Now the chaplain, stiff and meekly handsome, arrived and seated himself behind the podium. Marine members of the firing squad and the pallbearers were seated in the front to our left. The chaplain approached the podium and proceeded in his crisp, persuasive voice to deliver an excellent eulogy which was to our taste. He quoted from Jackie's letters: "I want to prove that there are good Americans and I'm going to prove it"; "Don't forget I love each of you very much and I always will. ... I pray a lot. All the time." Mother wept. Jack put his arm around her.

Finally, people were filing past the casket and exiting thru the avenue of marines at a nearby door. When they all had left the room, we gathered again by Jackie. We put our hands on the flag. I guess all of us prayed. It felt like we did. I kissed one of the red stripes on his flag and thought that I didn't want him to be in the ground.

At the cemetery the chaplain awaited the marines bearing their comrade. The casket was on a stand above the grave. Six marines held the flag which had covered his casket. I don't remember the exact sequence of events. The chaplain spoke. The firing squad used three volleys which sounded like large cap pistols. Taps was sounded. The marines folded the flag and the major presented it to Brian. Brian stood to receive the flag. His glasses slipped down on his nose. The bluish eyes behind them were moist but steady.

The major said, "You're a good marine." Brian straightened his shoulders and tilted his chin. "Thank you, sir."

On the way back to the limousine Mother was having trouble breathing. She was embarrassed that she had to be helped to the car. Paul was screaming uncontrollably. I thanked Alice and took him. In the car I got his water from my purse and gave it to him.

At home the house was suddenly uncozy. We sat in the front yard near the tree Jackie had planted. Jack said, "It should bear next year." Our friends came by, our neighbors. We wanted to see them. We were pleased to be visited. We wanted to hear their words. Their voices were good sounds. Their gifts rare and wonderful. Some said to us, most did, that as time wears on one forgets. I was thinking: "You don't understand, I am diminished. Look at us, we are the less." Time, they said, and said it over and over, time is the answer.

TWO TRUSTEES OF THE AEROSPACE CORPORATION RECEIVE EXCEPTIONAL SERVICE AWARDS

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at the annual meeting of the board of trustees of the Aerospace Corp., September 12 and 13, 1969, two of its most distinguished members retired after long and dedicated service: Mr. Sherrod E. Skinner and Lt. Gen. James H. Doolittle, USAF, retired.

As many of my colleagues will recall, the Aerospace Corp. was incorporated under the laws of the State of California June 3, 1960, to render scientific and engineering services to or for the U.S. Government. It was formed at the request of the Secretary of the Air Force to aid the U.S. Air Force in applying the full resources of modern science and technology to the problem of achieving those continuing advances in ballistic missiles and military space systems which are basic to national security.

The control, supervision, and direction of the general management of the corporation are vested in the board of trustees who are leading citizens selected from fields of industry, science, education, and public service, and who take very seriously their Aerospace trusteeship. The board meets at least four times a year and its several committees hold additional meetings. I believe that those who have had the opportunity I have had over the years to become familiar with the work of Aerospace will agree that the company's technical and managerial accomplishments attest to the faithfulness of the board's administration of its trust.

The chairman of the Aerospace Corp. board for all but 18 months of its more than 9 years' existence has been Mr. Sherrod E. Skinner, who has now retired. A submariner in World War I and director of the War Department's production division in World War II, Mr. Skinner was executive vice president of the General Motors Corp. when he retired in 1961 after 31 years with that company.

Elected board chairman of Aerospace in 1961, Mr. Skinner served actively and continuously in that capacity until his recent retirement.

Lt. Gen. James H. Doolittle, U.S. Air Force, retired, needs no introduction to this body. Jimmy Doolittle is perhaps best known for earning this Nation's highest award for valor, the Congressional Medal of Honor, for leading the heroic flight to Tokyo in 1942. But he has been a scientist, earning master's and doctor's degrees from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; an industrial executive, having served for many years with the Shell Oil Co., from which he retired as vice president and director; and a Government adviser, having served on many boards and committees, including one of special interest to me as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the AEC's Plowshare Committee. General Doolittle was elected to the Aerospace Corp. board of trustees in 1963 and served as vice chairman of the board from 1965 until just before his retirement.

I am pleased to note that on the occasion of their retirement the Secretary of the Air Force awarded both Chuck Skinner and Jimmy Doolittle the U.S. Air Force Exceptional Service Award for their service with the Aerospace board. The citation accompanying Mr. Skinner's award reads as follows:

Mr. Skinner distinguished himself by exceptionally meritorious service as Chairman of The Aerospace Corporation Board of Trustees from 12 December 1961 to 13 September 1969. During this period Mr. Skinner devoted himself unstintingly to the furtherance of the Corporation's role in aiding the United States Air Force in applying the full resources of modern science and technology to the problems of achieving those continuing advances in ballistic missiles and military space systems which are basic to national security. His efforts constitute an unusually outstanding contribution by a civilian in support of the Air Force's participation in the national defense and space programs, thereby reflecting great credit upon himself and have earned for him the sincere gratitude of the United States Air Force.

And the citation to General Doolittle reads:

Lieutenant General James H. Doolittle, United States Air Force, retired, distinguished himself by exceptionally meritorious public service as Vice Chairman of The Aerospace Corporation Board of Trustees and Chairman of its Executive Committee from 6 December 1963 to 13 September 1969. During this period General Doolittle was instrumental in the development and maintenance of a sound technical organization capable of foreseeing technical requirements of the United States Air Force. His devoted service has been attended by outstanding success in the accomplishment of this most difficult and exacting mission. His efforts constitute an outstanding contribution in support of the Air Force's participation in the national defense and space programs, thereby reflecting great credit upon himself and have earned for him the sincere gratitude of the United States Air Force.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my own congratulations to these gentlemen for their distinguished service, and to send every good wish for the future. The Nation has been fortunate that men so dedicated have served in these important capacities. I am pleased to note the elec-

tion of Mr. V. G. Nielsen, a trustee since 1961, as vice chairman, replacing General Doolittle, and of Dr. T. Keith Glennan, former AEC Commissioner, first Administrator of NASA, and president emeritus of Case Institute of Technology, as chairman of the board, replacing Mr. Skinner. I congratulate these gentlemen and am certain that they will serve with the same high distinction that has become characteristic of the Aerospace Corporation board of trustees.

POTOMAC VALLEY TEST FACILITY

HON. ALAN CRANSTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, few people get upset about pollution unless they have to swim in it. The average man finds the subject easy to belittle until one morning he goes out and finds excrement in his own swimming pool. At that point pollution becomes important.

In Washington, it is particularly easy to think of pollution as someone else's problem despite the national disgrace which daily flows past us between the banks of the Potomac.

In the purified air of our Federal buildings, the oil-soaked beaches of Santa Barbara, the raw sewage discharged by U.S. Navy vessels in San Diego harbor, the internal combustion engine's constant defecation into the atmosphere of Los Angeles all are easy to ignore.

This observation on our Capital life was incisively underlined in a recently published article in Science magazine by Dael Wolfe. The proposal for a Potomac Valley Test Facility should bring home the message.

I ask unanimous consent that the vignette be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Science magazine, Sept. 5, 1969]

POTOMAC VALLEY TEST FACILITY

If we had had the foresight a few years ago to establish the Potomac Valley Test Facility, several recent national problems could have been handled more satisfactorily. An example was the problem of what to do with a large supply of unwanted poison gas in Colorado. The Army proposed to ship it by train to the East Coast and then dump it at sea off the coast of New Jersey. Had the Potomac Valley Test Facility been in existence, several containers of the gas could have been dropped into the Potomac River, between the White House and the Pentagon, from an altitude calculated to give the impact velocity expected at sea bottom. Dropping a few containers into the Potomac River would have given congressmen, Army officials, and other interested persons an opportunity to observe at first hand whether the containers survived unharmed, and if they did not, the rate of leakage of the gas and its effects on the neighboring flora and fauna. Nothing quite takes the place of direct, personal experience in evaluating an event and its consequences. The nation's central decision makers should not be denied this experience.

More recently, the Edgewood Arsenal and Fort McClellan have suspended open-air testing of nerve gas until a team of scientists can determine whether such tests are as free from danger as they are reputed to be. The National Academy of Sciences, which is frequently asked to advise the government on difficult technical matters, has its headquarters in Washington. Also nearby are the National Bureau of Standards, the Food and Drug Administration, and other agencies that can provide much technical information and relevant expertise. If open-air tests of nerve gas were conducted in or near Washington, representatives of appropriate agencies and of interested congressional committees could easily obtain the firsthand information which they will no doubt wish to have in evaluating the possible hazards of testing such gases in or near inhabited areas.

Another use of the Potomac Valley Test Facility would be in conducting studies of the sonic boom. Sonic boom tests have already been carried out in several parts of the country, but the test sites have been remote from Washington, and there is still considerable disagreement over the extent of the disturbance and the willingness of the public to accept repeated sonic booms. Again, firsthand information would be useful to the decision makers. If repeated tests were conducted over Washington, members of Congress and officials of responsible Executive agencies could observe the effects on babies, pets, the sick and the elderly, on classrooms and conferences, and also on widow panes and other fragile objects. They could learn for themselves just how much or little disturbance repeated sonic booms produce at various times of day and night.

There would be still other advantages of having a general-purpose test facility located in Washington. Studies of the time-zone effect indicate that physiological disturbances, loss of sleep, reduced effectiveness, and impaired judgment follow sudden transportation from a time zone to which a person is adapted to another, several time zones removed. However, there are individual differences in these effects, and the whole matter needs further study. Washington is full of people who make frequent trips to Europe, Africa, the West Coast, or Asia. Clearly they would be good subjects for studies of time-zone effects, and their number could readily be increased, for it would be easy to get nominations of politicians, bureaucrats, editorial writers, and others whose frequent or prolonged absence from Washington would be considered by many to be in the national interest.

SAVING THE PASSENGER TRAIN

HON. FLOYD V. HICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious to just about everyone in the country that passenger train service has deteriorated terribly. It is obvious that something must be done about it.

Just what should be done is anything but obvious.

On the one hand, we need rail passenger service now and are very likely to need it desperately in the future, so we must either preserve the trains presently in operation or face the prospect of starting from Genesis with new trains when the need becomes really pressing in a few years.

On the other hand, the current prac-

tice is to make the railroads maintain service at a substantial financial loss, which is patently unfair; we don't do that to other transit services.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that what we must do for the immediate future is undertake a holding action until we can decide what ultimate course we should take. To this end I have joined the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS) and other Members in introducing legislation to give the Interstate Commerce Commission authority to set standards for passenger service. And to this end I propose a moratorium on any and all actions to discontinue passenger trains until we find a solution to the problem.

Right now the ICC has before it a proposal by the Northern Pacific Railroad to discontinue the Mainstreeter train, which runs between Minneapolis and Puget Sound, my home territory. I have urged the railroad and the ICC to hold off on this action for the present, although I sympathize with the railroad's reluctance to go on losing money—it is a business, and businesses just are not set up to lose money voluntarily.

And I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress has got to come to grips with this problem. We cannot afford to evade it. We have got to find a solution, or the problem will solve itself by doing away with money-losing passenger trains. That means most passenger trains, I am afraid.

And I also think that blaming the railroads for the decline in service does much to further the cause. As I said, they are businesses and do not like to volunteer to lose money.

I am told that right after World War II more than a billion dollars was spent to put together some of the finest trains in the world. More millions went into advertising.

What happened? Well, Mr. Speaker, between 1946 and 1958, when the railroads were spending all this money to attract passengers, the railroads' share of intercity passenger traffic dropped from 72.9 to 31.1 percent. And now it is down to about 12 percent.

That is among for-hire carriers. If automobiles are counted in, railroads figure that they are carrying only about 1 percent of intercity travelers. That is not an exciting market.

So railroaders started cutting trains. They are accused of downgrading service so people would not travel on their trains, so they in turn could justify discontinuing the trains. Perhaps they have done so. But we could argue for the next 10 years about which came first, the "chicken" of declining passenger traffic or the "egg" of downgraded trains, and it would not bring us any nearer a solution.

The basic fact of life in this context is that everybody is in a hurry. If I were to travel to my district by train, it would take me 3 days. Even at 100 miles an hour without stopping, a train to my home would take 30 hours. A jet can make it in five.

We may yearn for a gentler, more relaxed age. We may think back to the time when we could board a train and settle back for a long trip, eat good meals,

pass some time in the lounge car, observe the countryside. As a matter of fact, I did just that when I returned to Washington, D.C., from the congressional recess in August—traveled by train from Tacoma, Wash., to Chicago just for old times' sake while there are still fine trains to travel on; but I traveled from Chicago here by jet, and I will continue to cross the country by jet.

Certainly passenger trains are not what they used to be. Dining cars are disappearing, sleepers are almost a thing of the past on some trains, the equipment is getting somewhat rickety. No one denies that, not even the railroads.

The conclusion one hears mostly is that if the railroads would just put out some money to improve their equipment, they would attract plenty of passengers.

It is worth a try. That is why I favor giving the ICC the authority to regulate adequacy of service.

But that is still only a holding action. Anyone who thinks it is a cure-all may be about to let the patient die.

What I am saying is that we need to be careful in our diagnosis, to take a little more time. But above all we must sincerely and aggressively make a diagnosis.

Railroads are too important to this country to be ignored in this critical matter.

Whenever there is a threat of a nationwide strike or lockout, the best efforts of everyone involved, including Government, are bent to head off such a catastrophe.

Why all the concern? Is it the threatened stoppage of passenger service? Certainly not.

It is because we suddenly remember that railroads have a freight service which is absolutely indispensable. We remember that more than 40 percent of the country's intercity freight goes by rail. We remember that if railroads stop running the wheels of commerce could not turn at their usual speed; and if the stoppage were to last very long, commerce could very well stop too.

So we must act cautiously. We must weigh the possible results of our actions.

If we place intolerable burdens on the railroads, what will happen?

Will freight charges be increased to cover the new expense? And if they are—to the degree necessary to keep the railroads going—what will that do to the price of every consumer item that is shipped by rail?

Railroads are businesses, operated to earn profits, like any other business. Their stockholders are entitled to the same consideration as any others. Their employees, too.

If there are public-interest factors in long-haul passenger service that take precedence over the profit factors, then we must consider the consequences.

I do not think we can tell the railroads: "Do this. Do that. Don't bother us with how much it will cost. We don't want to hear that you can't afford it. Just do it—sink or swim."

The railroad industry has advanced a proposal that would provide for reimbursement to railroads required to run

money-losing passenger trains in the public interest.

That may not be the only answer, or the best answer. But it is worth considering. As are all the other proposals that have been made.

Let us be clear about one point.

The issue that presently concerns us is not commuter service. Commuter trains have their own problems. But a lack of passengers is not one of them, and I do not think they are in any danger of being discontinued.

And we are not really talking about medium-distance rail travel in densely populated corridors. The early success of the Metroliner indicates there is a bright future for trains like that.

But the big question is the future of long-haul, intercity passenger trains.

The problem is that it costs more to run most of them than they bring in.

This is not just a railroad claim. It is now backed up by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

In a recent study of eight railroads, the ICC came to the conclusion that those eight railroads could have saved \$118 million by not running passenger trains last year.

Now that is a lot of cash, and I do not think we can lightly tell the railroad industry that it must go on losing this kind of money—not only lose it but toss more into the same well.

It is sometimes said that railroads owe the country passenger service because of land grants. Certainly they did at one time. Perhaps they still do, but that obligation will not last forever at the rate railroads say they are losing money on passenger trains. In any event, Federal land grants were a factor in less than 8 percent of the total rail mileage.

There is something else we always hear in any discussion of passenger service.

That is the excellence of some foreign passenger trains—Canadian, European, and especially Japanese.

We need to look at this situation more carefully, too.

For one thing, those railroads are Government-owned and, in Europe and Japan, automobile ownership is nowhere near as high as it is in this country—meaning that fewer people have a reasonable alternative to rail travel.

Even with these advantages, the Canadian National Railroad loses about \$50 million a year on passenger service, and the Japanese National Railway System lost \$261 million in 1968. All foreign railroads have an average deficit of about 20 percent. In other words, they have to spend \$1.20 for every \$1 they take in.

So that argument does not get us very far either.

Here is another thing to think about: We are spending an awful lot of public money on transportation these days but we are letting the railroads go it pretty much alone.

Federal spending—leaving aside State and local—is estimated at \$6 billion in 1969 for highways, waterways, airports, airways, and aircraft development and direct airline subsidies.

Meanwhile, the Federal Government has appropriated \$13 million for research and development on high-speed intercity

ground transportation—and only \$4.3 million of this was for rail projects.

Now, I am not saying other forms of transportation are not essential to this country's economy and progress. Certainly not. And I am not criticizing all of these other expenditures. But it may be time to take a look at our priorities if we want a balanced transportation system.

Out in "Boeing Country," we have been able to see what can be done when Government and industry work toward a common goal—through research and the development of a technology that has helped a private industry achieve greatness and improve its service to the public.

If fine passenger trains are the goal, I see no reason why Government and the railroads cannot cooperate in a similar manner.

But that is just another possibility. We may find the corridor trains like the Metroliner are all the country needs or even wants.

It just may be that Congress is a little behind on this issue. It may be that the public has already voted—with their travel dollars. And it may be they have voted against the longhaul passenger train—regardless of any laws we may pass or any new technology we may develop.

And it may be that times will change again. The airways are getting crowded and the highways are worse.

So my suggestion is that we plan a holding action that will maintain the nucleus of a passenger train system while we get more solid answers. And that we do this without ruining an industry.

We need to cut down on the heat and let in a little more light on this whole question of passenger travel.

THE 1969 PLATFORM OF THE YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUBS OF MARYLAND

HON. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on September 20, 1969, the Young Democratic Clubs of Maryland met in annual convention. All the convention's decisions and deliberations are of deep interest to me, but I look forward, especially, to studying the "platform" adopted by this outstanding group representative of Maryland's conscience and community leadership.

The 1969 platform is well prepared and thought-provoking. It has been well received in Maryland and while each of us may disagree with some of the platform recommendations, the document should be very useful to Members of Congress and many others. I ask unanimous consent that the 1969 platform of the Young Democratic Clubs of Maryland, together with the names of the distinguished platform committee, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the platform and list were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE PLATFORM OF THE YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUBS OF MARYLAND, 1969, AS ACCEPTED AT THE CONVENTION MEETING, SEPTEMBER 20, 1969

The United States of America, a Nation which has made that one giant leap for mankind, evolved to world leadership, and is the most affluent nation on earth, is still unable to solve its own social, political and economic problems. Millions of our fellow countrymen still suffer from the lack of proper medical attention, food, housing, education, jobs, and social acceptance. In these critical times, demanding dynamic leadership and the solution of present problems now, we, as young Americans and the young Democrats of Maryland in convention assembled, striving for the ultimate goals of all men—life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, peace throughout the world, and brotherhood for all mankind—state the following as our programs:

BUDGET PRIORITIES

We recommend that as a first order of business the Congress clearly set forth established priorities of needs to be accomplished in the decade about to open, and that our large but limited resources be allocated so as to provide workable solutions to these problems.

Although defense of our people must always have a high priority, we believe that research on weapons systems and a reasonable stockpile of hardware can be maintained at a fraction of the current cost. The Congress should also make every effort to obtain quality for the defense dollar and avoid useless expenditures for undesirable overkill systems.

Highest priority should go to certain of our domestic needs, specifically:

- (1) Adequate housing, health care and diet for all our citizens;
- (2) Education and job training to prepare all our citizens to lead useful lives in our complex civilization;
- (3) Crime control so as to insure that each of our citizens is safe in his life, liberty and property;
- (4) Clean water and clean air so that life on this planet is worth living; and
- (5) Tax reform.

CIVIL RIGHTS

In the area of civil rights we support all efforts to insure individual equality and dignity to all people regardless of their race, creed, sex, or color; this includes voting rights, housing, education and job opportunities. We condemn any attempts to postpone rational steps toward the ultimate goal of equality. We condemn segregation in any form. Although we realize that it is more desirable that progress in civil rights comes about through changes in individual attitudes, which we will do all possible to encourage, we support the government in assuming leadership through legal processes in the area of civil liberties.

LAW, ORDER, WITH JUSTICE FOR ALL

Intolerable living conditions in our cities, inadequate national response to the granting of full citizenship to the minority groups of our nation, poorly trained as well as underpaid, overworked and understaffed police and the backlog of cases to be tried in the courts, and the abominable conditions in our penal institutions are major reasons why crime and rioting have reached alarming proportions.

We suggest that Maryland establish new, and more adequately funded community self-help programs similar to Washington, D.C.'s PRIDE. Such programs help to overcome alienation and poor community morale which contribute to anti-social behavior. To further reduce hostility and frustration of deprived youth, we advocate the extension and establishment of summer camps such as the one held at Fort Meade this summer for city youth.

A major cause of rioting throughout the country is the injustice of our state and na-

tional policies in regard to minority groups. We therefore recommend that all appointed and elected officials, both on the state and national level, do their utmost to enforce civil rights laws.

Although we must eliminate the causes of crime and rioting, we must also make sure that offenders are properly apprehended and brought to justice. To accomplish this we must increase the quality and effectiveness of Maryland's police and therefore we suggest intensification of Law Enforcement programs in Educational Institutions including financial aid for those police officers who attend. Further, we suggest that the salaries of law enforcement employees be increased so that we can recruit the highest quality people.

We also ask that the State of Maryland institute a study of the backlog problem in its courts, following Chief Justice Burger's suggestion that the nation's courts immediately develop a corps of trained administrators to manage the litigation machinery so that judges can get on with the disposing of cases. We also believe that all judges in Maryland should be members of the Maryland Bar.

We advocate the abolition of the death sentence in Maryland. To reduce the high return rate to our state prisons and decrease the crime-producing atmosphere in so many of our penal institutions, we further advocate that the Committee on Correctional Administrations should intensify its studies and use as consultants capable criminologists, psychiatrists, and other qualified professionals and report its findings to the public.

An upgrading of the requirements and remuneration for all personnel in prison administration would enable all employees to use the most modern and effective means of rehabilitating and protecting prisoners. Consequently, we support a substantial increase in the Department of Correction's budget.

We recommend the institution of Halfway Houses for juveniles in Maryland and the appropriation of more funds for the present Maryland juvenile institutions and the extension of constitutional guarantees to juveniles.

We support peaceful demonstrations but deplore the use of violence and intimidation by police, students and others; however we do not approve of the Federal Government withholding or withdrawing Federal loans to students on those campuses where violence occurs.

We recommend that the General Assembly review the establishment of a law requiring that a person obtain a license to own a gun.

Because heavy users of hard drugs and marijuana have emotional problems, we advocate that the laws pertaining to the use of hard drugs and marijuana as a criminal offense be abolished, and in their place a more rational system of dealing with these problems be adopted. The adoption of the above new drug code should provide for strict enforcement against violations of that code involving "pushing" and illegal sale of drugs. We also support the use of methadone for the treatment of drug addicts.

HEALTH

The opportunity to enjoy good health should be the right of every American and must not be dependent upon ability to pay. We therefore favor a national comprehensive health insurance program that will cover all Americans and which will replace the present patchwork of special programs. Meanwhile we recommend the state take the following action:

- (1) Expand services in the area of family planning, pre-natal and post-natal care.
- (2) Medicaid—Increase efficiency of payments to physicians and pharmacies in hopes that prompt payments will encourage broader selection of services.
- (3) Make health programs more accessible and more comprehensive.

- (4) Make more community facilities available for senior citizens.

A vigorous food distribution program must be the Nation's number one priority until such time as hunger and malnutrition are eliminated. Food stamps should immediately become free as an emergency measure. Distribution of food stamps on the state level should be more accessible and better publicized. Nutritionist services should be available at each neighborhood health center.

Mental illness, the number one health problem in Maryland, affects almost 400,000 of our residents. We believe that a state which ranks tenth in per capita income can afford to do better than the present thirty-sixth in per capita expenditures for community mental health programs. We therefore urge a substantial increase in expenditures for community mental health programs. Emphasis in community services should be on those most neglected—the impoverished and the young.

Maryland's mental hospitals are now largely providing custodial care for their patients. Therefore these institutions should receive more adequate operating funds until they can be gradually replaced by community services.

Alcoholism has been recognized as a health problem in Maryland, but to develop the necessary community facilities and programs there must be funding.

Drug abuse should be considered a health and mental health problem, not just a criminal problem. Treatment services should be expanded through local Health Departments.

We strongly recommend the passage of legislation which will provide for the emergency admission to a mental health facility of persons who are considered likely to harm themselves or others because of mental illness. Such legislation should treat such disorders as illness, not crime, and should safeguard the individual's rights and dignity to the maximum extent possible, consistent with the needs of society.

Many of Maryland's laws dealing with mental illness are archaic in language and content. We endorse the Pierson Commission's revision of these codes which will be introduced in the next General Assembly.

For several years we have urged the establishment of small regional facilities to care for the needs of the mentally retarded. The Department of Mental Hygiene has now proposed a specific plan for the establishment of such facilities and we urge its immediate implementation.

We also endorse the proposal by the Secretary of Health to establish a Division of Mental Retardation to better coordinate the services for the retarded.

Maryland's waterways are becoming open sewers and our air is becoming an open gas chamber. We commend the intelligent stand taken by Governor Marvin Mandel against the use of DDT and we hope that he, *along with the legislature* will take strong steps to eliminate harmful insecticides, commercial wastes, industrial wastes and other pollutants from our environment.

EDUCATION

Since education is our investment in our future, it should receive top priority. In recent years, Maryland's sub-divisions have encountered rapidly increasing difficulty in financing their educational programs. To resolve this we recommend:

- (1) That the state should make a greater contribution to the sub-divisions for education by paying the entire cost of construction and more towards teachers' salaries.
- (2) At the same time the counties should hire only teachers who meet the state's standards and, the state should raise its standards for school construction as these standards are inadequate in some sub-divisions.
- (3) We advocate the establishment of educational parks and the use of these parks also as community and recreational centers.

- (4) We feel schools must operate on a year-round basis where students would still attend school for only nine months, but school terms would be staggered.

In order to provide an adequate education for handicapped children we recommend the following:

- (1) Legislation requiring the Department of Mental Hygiene and the Department of Education to co-operate in developing educational and treatment programs for emotionally disturbed children.

- (2) Headstart programs to prevent environmental handicaps in children and to aid those children already handicapped, but we feel these programs must start at a much earlier age than at present, and they must be followed through by providing compensatory education in elementary schools and where necessary in high schools.

- (3) The enactment of the proposed legislation which will raise the minimum payment from \$800 to \$1,000 per child for development of public school special classes and also to parents who must send their children to private schools due to lack of adequate public classes.

We believe that most students will benefit from sex education, and we support the board of education's program in this regard.

In order to attract qualified teachers, we advocate not only higher salaries but also better teaching conditions such as: smaller classes; compensation for non-teaching duties; training programs for inner city teachers; and adequate quantity and quality of textbooks—i.e. modern texts which relate to all races, classes and levels of students; and the hiring of more teachers aides.

INCOME MAINTENANCE

Our welfare system is totally unworkable. Its goals should be to assure an income above the poverty level to every American while maintaining an incentive to become usefully employed. It should be administered by the Federal Government and maintain the dignity of the individual. The proposals recently submitted to the Congress accomplish many of these objectives: however, the proposed payments do not even reach the Federal Government's own definition of poverty-level income. With a raising of this level plus adequate provisions for job training, medical and dental care for the poor, and adequate old age assistance, our welfare system would become a model for all free societies.

TAX REFORM

If our self-assessment system of taxation is to work, the burden of governments must be shared fairly. Furthermore, taxes should not be so high and tax laws so complicated as to stifle business and individual incentive. We congratulate the Democratic House of Representatives on its Tax Reform and Reduction Bill and urge that such a bill pass the Congress this session and that future reforms be forthcoming shortly. We further urge that Maryland eliminate the State property tax and make its income tax truly progressive. Accordingly, we recommend that all State taxes be levied by and all appropriations be made by the General Assembly including debt service on bonded capital improvements. We also urge review and reform of the State farmland assessment law and State inheritance taxes. Finally, we recommend that the General Assembly permit a more flexible system of financing local government services, and devise new sources of revenue for our local governments.

HOUSING

Our slums, both urban and rural, are multiplying, and so are the problems they bring. We urge the immediate creation of more low-income housing including the use of special incentives to private industry, increased rent supplements, and special grants to local governments and non-profit housing organizations. We further urge that in slum clearance, urban renewal, and highway construction, special care be given to provide

adequate housing at the same cost to those displaced.

We support the Housing Act recently adopted by the General Assembly and urge its passage in the 1970 referendum. This law provides a housing authority which is essential to provide better housing and enforcement of housing regulations.

TRANSPORTATION

Our rapidly growing population is placing increased demands upon our transportation system. We must have fast, safe, and economic modes of transportation under the principles of fair competition. To meet the challenge of transportation, we propose a dynamic partnership between industry and government at all levels.

Recognizing the fact that our air traffic control system is ineffective through both obsolete equipment and worthless planning for the sake of fiscal expediency, we agree that Congress should immediately allocate funds to the Federal Aeronautics Board and the hiring of desperately needed air traffic controllers.

We support expanded assistance to mass transit in order to avoid increased congestion in center cities and to link residential and work areas. Thus we urge the immediate release of funds for the Metropolitan Washington subway system, the creation of a similar system in the Baltimore area, and a system linking the two areas. Furthermore, we, the Young Democrats of Maryland, condemn Democratic Congressman William Natcher of Kentucky for his cavalier treatment of Metropolitan Washington's vital public transportation system.

We support the development of high speed passenger trains to serve major areas.

We urge replacement and augmentation of our obsolete merchant ships with updated vessels built in American shipyards and the further development of harbors, ports, and inland waterways, especially the Panama Canal and St. Lawrence Seaway.

THE DRAFT

We support a random selection system which will reduce the period of eligibility for the military service to one year, guarantee fair selection, and thereby reduce the uncertainty from the lives of American young men. The present system leaves them totally uncertain as to their future during their academic careers. We support the instantaneous retirement of General Hershey.

CENSORSHIP

We believe that censorship is undemocratic in principle and advocate the abolishment of the Maryland State Board of Censors.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

We support expanded consumer protection legislation which provides for the following measures:

- (1) Investigatory and subpoena powers for the State Consumer Protection Division.
- (2) Enabling the local governmental units to provide for their own Consumer Protection programs, it being understood that the State does not mean to pre-empt this field, provided that local governmental units shall not enact any less stringent regulations than are enacted on the State level.
- (3) Authorizing Consumers to bring private actions under the present Consumer Protection law with the recovery of costs and attorney fees.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Since 1960 the United States has built up a powerful defense establishment and now enjoys a superiority in defense unlikely to be matched soon; therefore, we should now make every effort to build peace between East and West so as to make further armament unnecessary. The present administration must shift its emphasis from increased defense apparatus such as the costly Anti-Ballistic Missile system to increased

cultural, social, political and economic ties with the Soviet Union, Red China, and the countries within their spheres of influence.

To accomplish those objectives we must overcome certain obstacles to world peace. These include the conflicts in Viet Nam, the Middle East, and Germany.

We believe that the war in Viet Nam has been a political and economic fiasco and urge deliberate steps for immediate de-Americanization of the war. We support the negotiations in Paris, but feel that ultimately the final solution remains with the Vietnamese people.

The tensions in the Middle East remain a constant threat to world peace; we must do all within our power to eliminate them.

A meaningful arms control should be established which must include mutual arms quarantine in the Middle East.

It is our contention that a permanent peace in this area depends upon agreed and secured frontiers, respected for the territorial integrity of all states, the guaranteed right of free passage through all international waterways, a massive resettlement of the Arab refugees purportedly but not actually represented by el fatah, and the establishment of a non-provocative military balance.

To realize these goals for a permanent peace, we advocate negotiations with the prime parties concerned, and if these attempts fail, we support a negotiated peace arbitrated by the United States, Russia and a neutral nation.

We further believe that the situation in Europe has stabilized to such a degree that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is no longer needed as a military tool to prevent aggression from Soviet Russia. It should be scrapped as a military alliance and converted into a political and economic development of the European community and the rest of the world. A substantial reduction of military material and personnel will facilitate a greater feeling of security throughout Europe and prepare for mutual disarmament, and for greater and freer economic intercourse within the European community and the rest of the world.

We further believe that though South America is struggling for political and economic development, she is confronted with grinding poverty, illiteracy, and a stubborn resistance to constructive change. The aspirations and frustrations of the people are frequently exploited by self-serving revolutionaries who employ illegal and violent means.

Many Latin American nations formerly dependent upon America for aid, are now viable and stable as a result of this aid. We support strengthened U.S. development aid programs and their constant evaluation to insure that they alleviate the problems of the South American people rather than in aiding those self-seeking individuals not concerned with the political and economic development of their countries.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY REFORM

In recent years, there has been an increasing awareness by the public of the inequitable structure of political parties. Traditionally, politics has been a pursuit of power by the few, at the expense of the public's participation. In response to a gradual, but persistent, public awakening, this situation is now beginning to be remedied. The process is proceeding too slowly, however, as political parties encounter difficulties in wresting power from those with very definite, fixed interests in maintaining such power. We are concerned about the lack of progress in this area, and urge the following proposals for the Democratic Party, on a state or national level.

The governing, or policy-making body of a political party should be available to all who belong to the party. Presently in Maryland, registered Democrats have only the most limited access to party policy and de-

cision-making. This should immediately be remedied by the institution of the "Open Precinct" System, whereby all registered Democrats within a particular precinct would belong to the precinct organization, and be entitled to vote on all matters within the precinct. They would elect all precinct-level party officials and also elect delegates to the County Party organization, which would be composed solely of delegates from the local precincts. The County organization would, in turn, elect all County-level party officials, and delegates to the State Party organization, as well. The State organization would, in turn, elect all State Party officials from within its ranks. In this way, all Party officials would be elected and all policy decisions would be made by representatives chosen in a manner which would ensure the maximum participation and access of members to the Democratic Party.

Failure to reform our Party to allow this increased participation and access to Party affairs will result in a diminution of interests, membership and effectiveness in the Democratic Party.

We challenge, therefore, the Democratic members of our State and Federal Legislatures to submit and defend our platform's suggestions as to their respective bodies.

NATIONAL ELECTION REFORM

We recommend the abolishment of the electoral college and endorse popular elections of national candidates.

YOUNG DEMOCRATS

We urge that the Democratic Party sincerely attempt to involve more youth within the framework of the Party. We also recommend that government commissions, boards, and agencies include, as members and advisors, more young people, especially where the activities are relevant to their lives. We further urge that the Democratic National Committee rescind its recent directives affecting the Young Democrats, including the cancellation of the National Young Democratic Newsletter. We believe that the Democratic Party should make every effort to include all young people in the Party through the Young Democrats.

Finally, we earnestly support a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age to eighteen.

PLATFORM COMMITTEE

Jay S. Bernstein, Chairman.
Linda Kroh, Vice Chairman and Secretary.

William Bradford, Vice Chairman.
Martha Fenton, Vice Chairman.
Stuart Goldberg, Vice Chairman.
Michael Gordon, Vice Chairman.
Anita McCain, Vice Chairman.

A. B. Chisholm, Charlotte Chipper Debusky, Kenneth B. Frank, Ben Griffith, David Lentz, Carl A. Maio, Jean Morris, Larry Otter, Janet Shedd, and Linda Thiel.

MONTCLAIR'S GREATEST DAY

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, as a final note to that wonderful day for Montclair, N.J., when her own Buzz Aldrin came "home," I want to insert the following editorial which appeared in the Montclair Times of September 11. Everyone connected with the magnificent planning and execution of this tribute deserves the highest commendation, for it was truly a day to remember with pride.

MONTCLAIR'S GREATEST DAY

"At Tranquillity Base stands a proud native son of Montclair."

"Well done, Buzz!"

"There are footprints on the moon and they belong to you."

"Montclair's Red Letter Day."

"Psalm 8: When I consider Thy heavens, the work of Thy fingertips, the moon and the stars which Thou hast ordained; what is man that Thou art mindful of him?"

These are the quotes which will make Aldrin Day a treasured moment for those of Montclair and surrounding communities who were there for any or all of the outpouring of genuine recognition for a man who didn't get to the moon easily.

Aldrin's education at Montclair High School, the guidance of Clary Anderson, the confidence of former Senator Hawkes who appointed him to West Point, the inspiration of his father, an aviation pioneer, and years of hard work have made Buzz Aldrin an inspiration to the youth of this country that desperately needs to know the value of meaningful effort to make themselves a part of the world of tomorrow. He and his colleagues have also been a unifying force in a world where men have forgotten that the earth is so small a part of the universe that frustration, bloodshed and riots can hopefully be subordinated into an effort to bring together all mankind. Mayor Carter said it: "We hope Moscow and Peking are listening." Col. Aldrin and his partners have done what no statesman in the world has so far wrought: True recognition that our planet is part of a vast cosmic design that should be explored in a common effort.

And to Commissioner Theodore MacLachlan, who did a magnificent job as chairman of Saturday's tribute to Montclair's native son, must go the heartfelt thanks of a proud community.

SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 1969

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, I think we should move ahead with the supersonic transport without any further delay. After all, it is the next logical step in commercial aviation and one which this country should take if we are to maintain our world leadership.

Other countries have built supersonic transports—the British and French are now flying two Concorde prototypes and the Soviets are flying at least one prototype of their TU-144 supersonic transport. This competition we are engaged in is real and, if their programs continue to be successful, those countries will take over a large share of the leadership we now enjoy.

Since the Government is sharing in the costs, the contracts with the manufacturers include investment recovery provisions, giving the Government the right to royalties on the sales of SST products. If the program is successful, the Government will get its money back plus an additional return, depending upon how successful the program is. The royalty formula is designed for the Government to break even at the sale of 300 SST's and to receive further return on additional sales.

Now, of course, the Government is not involved in the program for reasons of

making money or a profit. The Government is involved in the program for the reason of national benefits and, basically, to get the SST built.

Air transportation is important to our country, since it is the Nation's seventh largest industry and growing faster than any other major segment of our economy. For the past 20 years, air travel has been growing at a rate of about 17 percent annually, which is nearly double the rate of the second most vigorous industry in our economy—electric utilities.

It is obvious to me that we must have this program to remain in harmony with our national standards and goals. I endorse the proposed program by the President completely.

SST COMMENTARY

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the administration is telling us to cut back on the financing of such vital measures as air and water pollution control as well as in the field of education, we are told that, of course, we can spend \$100 million a year on Federal subsidies for a civilian supersonic transport plane.

Susan Truitt, who performs so ably as a television reporter for Metromedia News, made a brief commentary on this situation this week. It is short and to the point. It sums up in capsule form the way priorities are being set in the White House.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to take a brief moment, look over Mrs. Truitt's commentary, and then decide if our priorities are not quite badly mixed up.

Mrs. Truitt's commentary follows:

At this moment in Washington . . . there are dozens of public officials that admit they just don't have the money to do the job.

The Mayor has told D.C. General Doctors . . . they can't heal the sick . . . not because they don't have the technology . . . but they don't have the money.

Washington's War on Poverty has just been told it's lost a million dollars . . . not because it isn't doing the job . . . but the funds aren't there.

The Welfare Department has admitted the recipients do need money for school clothes . . . but the funds aren't there.

And the President has ordered a cutback on water pollution control . . . and federal construction . . . because all that spending contributes to the monumental inflation.

But perhaps the most paradoxical aspect of having money for an SST is . . . that we don't have money for adequate air traffic control . . . or adequate airports for the planes we already have.

It is very true that we will be able to get to Tokyo faster . . .

But the old questions are still with us . . . Can we make it past Indianapolis? and if we do . . . can we find our baggage . . . ? For that matter . . . can we even get thru the traffic to the airport?

And . . . as for keeping America first in aviation . . . didn't the moon shot cover that?

SUSAN TRUITT,
Metromedia News.

WASHINGTON.

TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS AND THE 91ST CONGRESS

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on September 16, my colleague Mr. MURPHY of New York had the honor to speak at the Traffic Club of Hudson County's Steamship and Foreign Freight Forwarders Night. More than 250 steamship and freight forwarder executives and their clients attended the affair. Mr. MURPHY's remarks centered on legislative matters before the 91st Congress dealing with transportation problems. Very few people are aware of the crisis in the transportation industry and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I include his address in the RECORD:

TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS AND THE 91ST CONGRESS

I want to thank you first of all for giving me the privilege of speaking to you on your Traffic Club's Steamship and Foreign Freight Forwarder Night.

As a Member of Congress, I think the most appropriate subject I can talk on is legislation. But I will confine my remarks to several legislative matters which hold a specific interest for you. These are the freight forwarder bill and the authorization and appropriation for the merchant marine. Incidentally many knowledgeable transportation authorities say that both industries are in serious trouble.

The freight forwarder bill—H.R. 10293—has generated considerable interest even though no hearings have been held on it so far this year. And it has something of a history.

Last year, there was a bill before the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics, of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. That particular measure—H.R. 10831, 90th Congress—would have amended Part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to permit freight forwarders to enter into rate contracts with railroads.

The intent here was to place the freight forwarders in a relationship with railroads which is similar to the forwarders' relationship with motor carriers. Section 409 which covers this matter, and which has been amended several times previously, provides that freight forwarders under Part IV may enter into contracts with common carriers by motor vehicle subject to Part II of the Act.

In such relationship with motor carriers, the compensation paid under the contracts is comparable with divisions of a joint rate rather than with compensation paid to carriers by shippers under a regular published tariff.

The legislative proposal would have allowed the forwarders a similar rate contract position with railroads. In other words, the forwarders were seeking the right to negotiate special rates with railroads, rather than having access only to the railroads' existing published rates open to all shippers.

As you know, freight forwarding goes back many, many years, with its basic function of pooling and consolidating smaller shipments into larger ones including all of the activities directly related to this function. In fact, the forwarders have been described as the less-than-carload arm of the railroads.

When containerization first began to make its imprint as an important transportation practice in the form of piggyback about ten years ago or so, the pinch began to be felt by the freight forwarders, as those of you in the business are keenly aware. They were never able to take full advantage of the

piggyback concept. The forwarders are not permitted to make use of the various piggyback plans on any rate basis but are limited to that of published rail rates. Joint rates such as those the motor carriers are permitted to negotiate are not allowed.

The legislation failed to get anywhere, and this is a little surprising. I say this because the Department of Transportation, the Interstate Commerce Commission, which administers the freight forwarders portion of the Commerce Act, and the Federal Maritime Commission, all supported it.

In a letter from the Department of Transportation to Committee Chairman Harley Staggers, dated October 27, 1968, the Department said:

"We are of the opinion that joint rate arrangements would be an appropriate arrangement for freight forwarders in dealing with railroads and motor carriers. Nevertheless, we recognize that there is also merit to the approach of extending the scope of section 409(a) to include the making of contracts between the railroads and the forwarders. As a matter of fair and impartial regulation, it would seem appropriate to accord the forwarders the same treatment in dealing with both railroads and motor carriers."

And earlier that year, on January 23, 1968, the Interstate Commerce Commission had written to the Chairman of the Subcommittee, Congressman SAMUEL FRIEDEL, setting forth the Commission's recommendations on this proposal. The statement made the point that:

"In general, these recommendations reflected our belief that, while a freight forwarder legally is a shipper when dealing with other modes of transportation, its relationships with these other carriers are sufficiently distinct and different as opposed to any other large shipper or exempt shipper association, established under section 402(c) of the Act, so as to warrant special consideration."

Finally, in a letter dated January 22, 1968, the Maritime Commission stated that if the proposal is needed:

"To provide an improved service to the shipping public and is not inconsistent with our overall transportation policies, then such legislation should be favorably acted upon by the public interest."

But Congress failed to enact such a proposal in 1968, and so we have a new proposal before the 91st Congress.

The present bill takes a different tack. It would amend Part I of the Commerce Act, which is the portion that deals with the railroads. Part I would be modified so as to permit, in effect, common carriers including freight forwarders, to negotiate with railroads for rates.

Perhaps this year will see a breakthrough for the forwarders.

But do not become complacent. I warned previously that the industry is in trouble. The reason for this danger can be put quite simply. The common carriers—rail and motor—are both willing now to offer services they were unwilling to perform in the past. And it was this lack of service that led to the creation of the freight forwarding industry.

A second major legislative matter which is, I am sure, of special interest to you is the merchant ship construction subsidy.

As you are aware, we are at a critical stage with our merchant marine fleet. About 70 percent of our fleet of fewer than 1,000 vessels are 20 years or older.

The Administration's budget request which went to Congress last January contained only \$15,918,000 for the ship construction account. This amount, together with carry-over funds of previous years, was intended to provide Federal funds for the construction of ten or eleven new vessels.

The House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee found this amount of \$15 mil-

lion totally inadequate, and authorized \$145 million for ship construction. The House, acting as a Committee of the Whole, agreed and accepted the \$145 million authorization.

Subsequently, the Appropriations Committee of the House went even farther and recommended an appropriation of \$200 million for ship construction—or \$55 million more than that authorized by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. It was intended to build 30 or more vessels.

Unfortunately, when the \$200 million came up for approval in the House, the Senate had not yet acted on the authorization. So the item of ship construction funds was stricken from the Maritime Administration appropriation. Undoubtedly, it will reappear later in this session. And, it will just as surely be substantial.

I think the important point in all this is that there is reflected an awareness of the critical state confronting our merchant marine, and a determination of key Members of Congress to initiate a program of rebuilding the commercial fleet. Action taken by the 91st Congress could mark the turning point of our entire merchant marine industry.

And while on the topic of Congressional legislation relating to maritime matters, I might mention in passing maritime bills introduced in which key Members in both the House and Senate have indicated they support. These proposals would revise and strengthen our entire merchant marine posture. Indicative of their scope, it is proposed to establish an authorization of \$300 million in ship construction subsidy funds for each of the next five years. Such a program would place the industry on a peacetime level of activity it has not experienced for many years.

And now, turning to a non-legislative subject, I mentioned previously the new concept in transportation: containerization.

This relatively new form has sent all of you to the drawing board. And it won't be all smooth sailing. Witness the recent jurisdictional uprising of the Federal Maritime Commission when the Interstate Commerce Commission issued its "Special Permission No. 70-275." Eyeing the land-bridge concept, the Commission declared that domestic carriers, which it regulates, and the merchant marine, which it does not regulate, could file through rates on import and export shipments.

Federal Maritime Commission Chairman, John Harlee, denounced the ICC action, terming it a violation of the law. The ICC thereupon suspended its action.

The appointment of Helen Delich Bentley as Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, I would like to add, should be an asset in solving jurisdictional disputes. Mrs. Bentley and Mrs. Brown, the capable Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission have resolved this issue.

The full thrust of international containerization is not making headway as fast as it should. At least that's the way Interstate Commerce Commissioner Dale Hardin sees it.

In the recent New England Forwarding Co. case, Commissioner Hardin wrote a dissent in which he enumerated the reasons why the development of international containerization is progressing far too slowly.

His reasons are (1) major overseas carriers' failure to publish container rates, (2) jurisdictional labor disputes in this country, (3) the controversy over the proper size of containers, (4) documentation, (5) customs problems both in the United States and abroad, (6) labor problems abroad, and (7) a lack of legal authority to file single-factor rates.

In spite of this, the container transportation concept is moving ahead. Its potential is vast.

And jurisdictional problems notwithstanding, if the land-bridge proves to have economic merit, its establishment will be inevitable.

We in Congress, along with those of you on the firing line, will be watching the continuing development of the containerization revolution, in all of its ramifications.

Let me assure you that I along with most Members of the Congress have an intense interest in making certain that the commerce of the United States, both at home and with foreign countries, will continue to grow. It must not falter for lack of proper transportation and distribution facilities. He assured that, as we consider legislation affecting industries which you represent and those in whose future you have a stake, we will welcome your views and will give the most serious consideration. Thank you for inviting me to be with you on this happy occasion.

JOHN CROOKER HAS AN OUTSTANDING RECORD OF SERVICE

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, Hon. John H. Crooker will step down as Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board soon, and before he leaves, I want him to know of the gratitude this Nation has for the way he has done his job. In the 18 months since he was named Chairman by President Lyndon Johnson, John Crooker has aggressively moved this agency on a progressive course.

I have known John Crooker since we were both in law school at the University of Texas in the mid-1930's. His academic scores set a track record; he was a Phi Beta Kappa and a member of virtually every other honorary academic society eligible to law students. His pace since college has not slackened; in fact, it has accelerated.

As a Navy officer serving under Admiral Kincaid, John Crooker received the Bronze Star and other battle decorations while serving the 7th Fleet in the Southwest Pacific area in World War II.

John Crooker has pursued his civic interests with the same fervor he developed during the war. He has been chairman of the Central YMCA in his home town of Houston; he has headed the Episcopal Churchman's Association in Houston; and he has been a bank president. All this in addition to conducting a very active law practice for three decades. Plus, he has maintained his constant interest in higher education—he has served for several years as a member of the board of regents of the State senior colleges of Texas.

During the time John Crooker has served as Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, I have observed—as a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—his keen grasp of legislative issues which vitally affect aviation; and I share the views of my colleague from Texas, Mr. BOB CASEY, that John Crooker has done an exceptionally outstanding job. His ability and his analytical leadership will long be remembered at the CAB. He did his homework. He knew his business. He is highly respected.

I know of few men who possess the rare balance of enthusiasm and wisdom of John Crooker. In record time, he be-

came a veteran in the intricacies of the air transportation problems—and its solutions. He has directed this agency with but one goal: better service for the public. He commanded the attention, and the respect, of a tough-minded industry.

The first year that John Crooker served as chairman, the CAB heard 23 percent more cases than it had the previous year—223 full and formal cases. During fiscal year 1969, the Board completed a record 1,496 dockets. The second-place year was fiscal year 1961 with 1,353 completed dockets. All this was managed without increased cost to the public, even though the agency absorbed some \$185,000 in pay raises. Efficiency breeds economy, obviously.

John Crooker, as much as any man who flies the commercial airlines, understands the industry. I am certain he will not object if I relate the sad tale of two passengers on separate flights to Austin. I was one of those passengers. In order to make an important engagement on time in Texas, I arranged for a helicopter shuttle between airports in the Dallas area. As my helicopter was landing beside the commercial airplane—they were closing the doors and hauling away the loading ramp. No amount of gentle persuasion on my part could convince the airlines to let me aboard.

Hours later, I arrived in Austin—too late for my meeting. Looking for someone to register a complaint with, when I spied Chairman John Crooker. He heard my complaint and smiled knowingly.

Not once, but twice, he was bumped from a standby position on a flight from Chicago to Austin. He understood and could sympathize. I could more easily accept this human involvement.

He is a great man and his understanding will be missed. Many of us will miss his presence here because a lifetime of friendship is involved. As the chairman goes, the best wishes of all members accompany him and his lovely wife Kay.

HOUSE NEEDS ELECTRONIC VOTING

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the House Standards of Official Conduct Committee has reported on the irregular voting in the House of Representatives in the last Congress.

The chairman of the committee, Congressman MELVIN PRICE of Illinois, urged a House administration subcommittee to approve an "error-proof voting system for the House of Representatives."

I applaud this recommendation and believe the House should have an electronic automatic voting system in the hall of the House.

Pending before the House Administration Committee is my bill, H.R. 397, which I introduced on the first day of this Congress. It would provide for a

modern, error-proof system of casting Members' votes. This legislation is something I have worked on since I came to Congress in 1949, and it was one of the first bills I introduced.

Voting procedures used now in the House of Representatives are, in my opinion, antiquated, time-consuming, and dangerous to our democracy. The recent case of irregularity in voting is a prime example of the possible threat to the continued public confidence and veracity of the House of Representatives. Mistakes in voting are noted frequently. The time of a rollcall lasts from 30 to 45 minutes. We are playing roulette with the most important gift of our democracy—a Representative's vote for his constituents and his country.

The space age demands a modern system for recording a Member's vote, not a horse and buggy method that is subject to error and misuse of the public trust.

I urge the House Administration Committee to report out my bill, H.R. 397, or similar legislation to allow the U.S. House of Representatives to install an electronic voting system.

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 24, 1969

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, today we pay tribute to a man who gets much joy out of serving others and it is an honor to work with this colleague. FRED SCHWENGEL serves the First District of Iowa with great care and with pride.

He serves well because he understands well—the people of his district, their needs, their future needs. He serves well because he knows and understands his job. FRED works hard for his constituents helping them get better schools, hospitals, and public facilities; assisting them in unraveling Government redtape; listening to their views and interpreting and presenting them to the Congress; effectively pushing for economic development and better programs for the farmers; and helping with a multitude of other problems.

I am privileged to serve with Representative SCHWENGEL on the Public Works Committee and I know how effective he can be. He works well with both parties, and has sponsored much important legislation in our committee.

This gentleman not only does a good job as the elected representative of the folks back home, but he takes on extra work on behalf of all Americans. I refer to his role as founder and president of the U.S. Capitol Historical Society.

More than anything the Capitol is the symbol of our democratic society. It belongs to all citizens and FRED SCHWENGEL has helped to acquaint Americans with the fascinating history of this building. The publications of the society are available nationally and are always in demand.

I congratulate my colleague on a great job and wish him many more successful years of service to Iowa and America.

SONIC BOOM

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 1969

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday President Nixon announced that he was pushing ahead with development of the supersonic transport. I strongly commend that action.

Unfortunately, we immediately heard criticism from some quarters concerning sonic boom—a phenomenon which I doubt will ever make as much noise in the sky as it already has on the ground.

Nevertheless, Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe has given us solid assurance that the plane will not be flown where the noise factor is unacceptable.

It will not be allowed to fly over populated areas unless the noise factor is within acceptable limits. I find that critics are failing the air with this sort of criticism.

The SST, with a projected nonstop range of 4,500 to 5,000 miles, has an excellent future market for transatlantic flights, for flights on the United States-South America runs and for transpacific flights.

The plane's outstanding characteristics; speeds up to 1,800 miles per hour, the ability to carry 300 passengers, and its tremendous range, will allow it to enter markets even the other supersonic planes cannot touch.

If, on the other hand, we fail to continue development of the SST, the British-French Concorde and the Russian Tupelov would soon saturate the market.

I urge my colleagues to lend their support to this program.

Mr. Speaker, President Nixon yesterday took another giant step for the prestige of this country and the pride of its people when he announced continued support of the supersonic transport.

One of my distinguished colleagues remarked Tuesday that the moon shot gave America enough eminence to last for a long time.

Gentlemen, I submit that world respect is not a commodity which can be earned by one action, one deed, one brilliant moment. Rather it is the continued leadership and achievement which day after day says to the world, "we are the country that promotes freedom and progress."

The SST is just another in the chain of achievements that the United States can point to with pride. To fail with continuation of the program would erase all that has already been accomplished.

The United States cannot afford to give up this opportunity for technological advancement, any more than it can afford to give up the profitable transoceanic travel market.

The United States now has approximately 80 to 85 percent of that market with existing aircraft. It is obvious, however, that without the SST, the British-French Concorde and the Russian Tupelov would soon erode our current domination.

I personally would feel a lot better knowing that the "friendly skies" are filled with U.S.-produced aircraft.

RAILROAD PASSENGER SERVICE

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 24, 1969

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13432, a bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to set minimum standards for railroad passenger service.

This bill represents another milestone in the long debate over the future of passenger rail service in this country. And it is essential that it be adopted now so that we may at least attempt to solve this very intricate and complicated problem.

Theoretically, the ICC already has the authority to regulate passenger service. However, it appears that their legal jurisdiction has been questioned and will continue to be questioned unless Congress acts to reaffirm by legislation the ICC's authority to establish standards for service.

A number of different issues come to play in this question of the future of passenger rail service. I have been studying the problem for some time, with particular reference to two passenger trains that directly affect my district in California—the California Zephyr and the City of San Francisco. These trains are the only two left that provide service from Chicago to San Francisco. Recently the respective railroad companies arbitrarily decided to discontinue these two trains.

Both cases are now pending before the ICC, but once again the old question of who can determine the quality and standards of service appears to be muddled and confuse the issue. Until the ICC's jurisdiction in this area is clearly reiterated by an act of Congress, very little can or will be accomplished.

These trains are not up to standards, but it is clear that there is a need for passenger rail service. At the same time, it is clear that railroad companies are doing all they can to downgrade service in order to discourage people from riding trains. This is a deplorable situation and should not be allowed to continue unchecked.

The "California Zephyr" and the "City of San Francisco" are cases in point, cases symptomatic of a nationwide crisis in passenger service. I mention these only to illustrate what might very well happen in the rest of the country if railroad management is allowed to determine what is good and what is bad and if the ICC is prevented from making these determinations that are necessary.

An efficient and smooth-functioning passenger rail service is a vital part of a balanced transportation system. The convenience of the public demands the continuance and improvement of such service both in congested urban areas

and in isolated rural areas. Modern passenger rail service will undoubtedly help ease our increasingly crowded skies and congested highways.

Conditions on passenger trains continue to get worse. The complaints of our citizens grow louder and more frequent. It is time we begin to take positive action in this area.

This bill, by reaffirming the ICC's jurisdiction in the area of setting standards for passenger trains is an important step on the road toward positive action. I have every good reason to believe, from past debate on this issue, that the Congress is disposed to the preservation of passenger rail transportation.

Let us now take this opportunity to save a very vital public utility. Mr. Speaker, I cannot overemphasize the importance of this bill. I urge my colleagues in this Chamber to adopt H.R. 13432.

THIS IS YOUNG AMERICA

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to be in attendance Tuesday night at the annual Air Force Association dinner-dance, and it turned out to be a most rewarding evening.

AFA was highlighting ROTC, and what an experience it was to witness the performance of the young Americans who spoke at the affair.

A young high school student stole the show. He was Cadet Lt. Edwin S. Sweeney of Oxon Hill High School, in Maryland, representing Junior ROTC. Miss Marjorie Erwin, national commander of the Angel Flight, also addressed the more than 2,000 persons who were present.

I was particularly proud of the representative of the ROTC program on our college and university campuses because he is from my old alma mater, Tulane University in New Orleans. Charles P. Azukus, national commander of the Arnold Air Society, gave a fine speech.

Listening to these youngsters was like a fresh breeze in a smoke-filled room. Here was really young America; youth we believe in.

Each youngster had a message, a contribution. These are the youth who speak for America, not the dissenters who try to wreck ROTC and destroy our Constitution and Nation. There was no generation gap between them and the audience. Their message came through loud and clear and it was a message of patriotism and love of country and fellow man.

And while this was going on, I could not help but wonder where our great corps of objective newsmen were. Where were the popping flashbulbs of the news photographers? Where were the klieg lights of television? Where were the hordes of reporters?

Needless to say, they were nowhere to be found. If it had been the other way around, though, if a group of anti-ROTC pickets had been causing trouble out-

side the hotel or trying to disrupt the function, the lights of news media cameras would have been blinding.

Or if it had been a gathering to protest ROTC and downgrade the military, a gathering of the Students for a Democratic Society or other radical minority group, the news media would have been there to record on film and tape every word which was said.

But here were kids in favor of ROTC. That was not news. Here were kids preaching America and patriotism. That was not news. Here were kids pouring their hearts out for belief in their country and ready to tell the world about it. But that was not news.

The record shows that today the news media, particularly television, finds news only in riots, disorders, obscenity, minority group protests, and antimilitary and anti-Government demonstrations.

Defiance of country, burning of draft cards, trampling of the American flag. Now that is news.

Never mind this. Come with me and look over my shoulder to see what was said that night. When you do, I know you will agree with me, that a fine organization, the Air Force Association, staged a fine program. It is worthy of everyone's attention.

The material referred to above follow:

Good evening, Ladies and Gentlemen.

Welcome to our Annual Dinner-Dance commemorating the 22nd anniversary of the United States Air Force.

Among the many Air Force leaders... past, present and future... with us on this festive occasion are two former Chiefs of Staff of the United States Air Force.

We take special pride in presenting... and paying our respect... to them.

Ladies and Gentlemen...

The First Chief of Staff of the Air Force, General Carl A. Spaatz.

And, the Sixth Chief of Staff of the Air Force, General J. P. McConnell.

As we pay tribute to the youngest, and the mightiest, of our military services, and to the glories of its past, we call special attention to the young people who will make up the Air Force of the future. We target in on the students of the nation's high schools and colleges... and specifically those students who are the youngest members of the Air Force Family... as they begin another school year.

I refer, of course, to the Air Force ROTC program, now active on 175 college campuses... and its Junior program—only four years old—but active at more than 100 high schools.

The Air Force Association's own link with the Future is our affiliate, the Arnold Air Society, comprised of more than 6,000 select Air Force ROTC cadets and the associated Angel Flights of some 5,000 college co-eds.

These dedicated young people have worked diligently and effectively—against many odds—in service to country... and we in AFA are mighty proud of them.

It has been our special pleasure to have the Executive Board of the Arnold Air Society convene in plenary session during this Fall Meeting and to work on programs which... I am confident... will further increase the effectiveness of ROTC and the Air Force.

These 27 Arnold Air Society leaders come from 22 different colleges and universities all across the country. I ask that they stand as a group so that we may recognize them.

Ladies and Gentlemen... the members of the Arnold Air Society's Executive Board.

Thank you.

AFA is fortunate to have the guidance and support of its Arnold Air Society Alumni

Council—a group which also is meeting concurrently with this Fall Meeting. I ask that Members of the Council stand so that we may recognize you.

Ladies and Gentlemen, the members of AFA's Arnold Air Society Alumni Council.

Thank you.

And as a fitting finale for our group introductions, let's wind up with the fair sex.

Ladies and Gentlemen . . . from Ohio State University . . . the six national officers of the Angel Flights.

Thank you.

No salute to the ROTC would be complete without a special tribute to the agency of the Congress most responsible for the revitalized ROTC Program . . . the House Armed Services Committee.

Ladies and Gentlemen . . .

A senior member of that committee . . . from New Orleans . . . Louisiana . . .

A man known as "the Father of the Modern ROTC Program", The Honorable F. EDWARD HEBERT.

And—that great friend of the men and women in uniform . . . from Charleston, South Carolina . . . the venerable Chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS.

Now, let's hear from some of the young people with us tonight.

First, from our Junior Air Force ROTC representative.

He comes from Oxon Hill High School in Maryland, just outside Washington, D.C. Now in his senior year, he ranks first academically among the 1500 students in his school.

He has been named to the Senior National Honor Society. His father is an Air Force Colonel on duty in the Pentagon . . .

Ladies and Gentlemen . . . the Cadet Commander of the Oxon Hill detachment, tonight representing the 19,000 students enrolled in the Junior Air Force ROTC program, Cadet Lieutenant Edwin S. Sweeney.

CADET SWEENEY'S REMARKS

Mr. Secretary, General Ryan, President Hardy, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen.

I am very honored to be here tonight representing 19,000 cadets across the nation. I am sure each of them would like to participate in the Air Force Association's salute to the ROTC program. I know that your endorsement of Junior ROTC will provide stature and strength to the program.

I have been asked to comment on the Junior ROTC Program. My remarks will primarily concern our squadron at Oxon Hill Senior High School.

I cannot overemphasize the qualities of leadership continually demonstrated by our instructors, Colonel Pavlakis and Sergeant Tatman. You can watch when a cadet first joins the program and see him develop over the two or three year period. Self-discipline and personal pride are two of the outstanding qualities one observes developing in the cadets. Human Relations and Leadership are highlighted throughout the program and there is no better time than High School to acquire this knowledge.

Also, I believe that Junior ROTC teaches us about the aerospace world and national security. This is very important because so much of the world in which we are living is associated with advances in aerospace development and national security. Even if one never goes to the moon, I think it is important that he understands a little bit about the science and engineering involved in going. Our aerospace education courses in the Junior ROTC Program give us this knowledge which is necessary to equip us to live in the world today.

Again, I'm very proud to be here tonight. I thank the Air Force Association for this salute. I accept it for each of the students in all the high schools across the country who are in the Junior ROTC.

Thank you again.

Next, a young lady, who will graduate next year from Ohio State University, majoring in elementary education. Her older sister is married to an Air Force major. Her younger brother will enter the Air Force next month. She wants to become an airline stewardess. She is training to become a private pilot. How about that?

Ladies and Gentlemen . . . The National Commander of the Angel Flight, Miss Marjorie Erwin.

MISS ERWIN'S REMARKS

The women's auxiliary of the AFROTC is a service organization dedicated to promoting interest in the cadet program, to educating the college woman to the military service, and to supporting the U.S.A.F.

In supporting the cadet program, we serve as hostesses, work on projects such as blood drives, or help cadets on briefings. Not only the men benefit from these activities—the Angels profit too because they learn the basics of the cadet program and military functions—and meet and often make some of the truest friends they'll ever have.

When an Angel takes a course in ROTC along with the cadets, she begins to realize the importance and the relevance of the Air Force. Since we are also exposed to the anti-military sentiments on campus, we get both sides of the story and are better qualified to make up our own minds—and need I tell you what side we're on!

I've had so many interesting and rewarding experiences since I've been an Angel. When sending cards to Vietnam at Christmas and Valentine's Day, she gets a sense of usefulness. The letters she receives are not only heart-warming but challenging in that they make an Angel want not only to support the USAF, but to advocate it!

When she works on a project like a party for disabled children, she has a sense of responsibility. She gets a feeling of worth and understands that indescribable feeling of helping others.

But the Angel Flight certainly isn't just a "service" organization. Here the women can form relationships with the other Angels and the Arnold Air Men that are lasting, warm, and wonderful. It's not only a challenge to be an Angel, it's a most rewarding experience. I'm very proud and honored to be a member of the Angel Flight.

And, a fourth year student at Tulane University in New Orleans, who has earned awards for academic achievement and proficiency . . . who is Manager of the Tulane football team . . . who is a staunch believer in the need to restore order and a spirit of positive patriotism to the nation's campuses.

Ladies and Gentlemen . . . the National Commander of the Arnold Air Society, Cadet Major Charles Paul Azukas.

CADET AZUKAS' REMARKS

Mr. Secretary, General Ryan, President Hardy, Distinguished Guests, ladies and gentlemen. Today as never before the ROTC on campus is under fire. In virtually every state on the various university campuses the ROTC system faces constant confrontation with dissident and disenchanting students and faculty.

Should then the ROTC move off the liberal arts campuses in favor of the more compatible surroundings of the military academies and service schools? *Definitely not.* We must face this current confrontation on the American campus not defensively but rather in a progressive approach in the areas of leadership and academic excellence.

The American tradition of the citizen soldier is deep in both tradition and value. The Air Force today not only has the mission to keep technologically abreast of our enemies, but it also must be aware of the sociological and psychological trends that move this country from within. One of the great strengths of our nation's military structure has been that our military men have never been *just soldiers*. But rather *citizen*

soldiers able to show rationality and logic in areas other than their immediate fields.

No . . . the ROTC should not be removed from the American campus but rather its position *should be solidified on it.*

We cannot afford to substitute our own confrontation tactics on this current campus issue but we must insure that stronger and more dynamic programs are constantly being introduced into the Air Force ROTC curriculums. . . . We of the Arnold Air Society have made it our mission to press for programs that will not be repressive to dissident student groups, but rather programs that will strengthen our curriculums to the point where they have reached *unchallengable excellence.* It is our sincere hope that when this has been accomplished we can substitute the word *communication* for the word *confrontation* on the American campus.

Thank you, each of you, and thank God we have people like you in the Air Force family.

And now, to climax this anniversary program, we will hear from the current leaders of the Air Force.

First, from the Chief . . .

Ladies and Gentlemen . . . the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, General John D. Ryan.

GENERAL RYAN'S REMARKS

One reason why I volunteered to make a speech at this Anniversary Dinner was that somebody told me the emphasis was going to be on two completely non-controversial subjects—Youth and ROTC.

Another reason for volunteering was a note of encouragement from Secretary Seaman. And his note did not include any place for "regrets."

A further inducement was a reminder that I should limit my remarks to three minutes.

I will start with a few observations about Youth. I consider Youth to be one of the oldest and best institutions in the world. After all, it has kept the "Establishment" on 24-hour alert throughout history.

Some years ago a famous novelist pointed out that our young people have a pretty good case against us which they haven't yet taken to court. If they wanted to press their case, they could get a judgment against us for defamation of character. And they could build their case on a lot of widely publicized and misleading claims that they are undisciplined, rebellious, dangerous, and generally a menace to the country.

I'm glad to say that my own experience at home and throughout the Air Force shows me a completely different picture. My efforts at career counseling, at home, netted us a hundred percent male representation in the Air Force.

Now it may very well be that sales resistance to the career package is a lot stronger across the board. But there are good indications that the Air Force is scoring much higher with young people than most of us realize. After all, the median age of Air Force men and women is between 22 and 23 years. And almost 80 percent of them haven't reached that magic crossover point of their 30th birthday.

But even more important than numbers is the matter of potential. On that point, I'd say that the young people in today's Air Force are better educated than any previous generation. As a result, they're more skeptical. You can't snow them and you can't look down your nose at them. But once they are convinced that something is worthwhile, they will do the job with a keen sense of mission and real dedication.

We see examples of this every day over a wide range of Air Force operations. That tells me that the key to success in bringing young people to their highest level of achievement is a special quality of leadership. "Get 'em young, treat 'em rough, and tell 'em nothin'" just isn't good enough. We've known that for a long time. We must now recognize that, more than security, they

want to identify personally with a constructive effort. And they want to challenge to their knowledge and skill as well as their stamina. As they say, they want to relate. They want to be relevant.

I believe that our leadership must stay closely attuned to these realities. For the future, we must continue to rely heavily on the AFROTC as a source for leadership.

There are many reasons why ROTC—for us and for the other Services—deserves continued support by all elements of our society. And this applies in particular to those critics who attack ROTC primarily as a means of expressing their opposition to the war in Vietnam.

One reason is that through ROTC, the armed forces are able to obtain officers who represent a broad cross section of the social, economic, and cultural interests of this country. This provides further insurance against the emergence of a parochial military clique.

Speaking for the Air Force, I want to emphasize that ROTC has proved to be an invaluable source of leadership that is uniquely tailored to the special requirements of the aerospace age. As exemplified by the membership of the Arnold Air Society, our cadets have demonstrated an impressive record in both the military and non-military phases of their studies.

Before I disqualify myself for a three-minute speech award, I want to say that I am happy to see them honored here tonight. It is good to know these AFROTC cadets, and others like them across the country, are the real index to American Youth!

Thank you, General Ryan.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Honorable Robert C. Seamans, Jr.

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE ROBERT C. SEAMANS, JR., SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, AFA AIR FORCE ANNIVERSARY DINNER, WASHINGTON, D.C., SEPTEMBER 23, 1969

Closing the generation gap

A few months ago I had a very striking encounter with the generation gap. As a member of the Harvard Board of Overseers I went to an informal meeting to review certain academic programs with a number of students. I was in the midst of an interesting discussion with an attractive Radcliffe girl when someone said: "I guess no one from the Overseers is even going to show up." When I acknowledged that I was an Overseer, the girl I was talking with said: "Oh, I hope you're not a member of the military-industrial complex!" At that point the generation gap opened up like the Grand Canyon. I'm not sure what reply she expected, but I am sure that "Secretary of the Air Force" was one step beyond her wildest fears.

There probably is not much any one of us can do about that particular sort of gap, although I hope it's realized that we are also human beings even though we may appear misguided or worse.

But there are aspects to the generation gap that can and must be resolved—at least within the Air Force.

The traditional problem arises because those of us in the older generations tend to become set in our ways. We all have a tendency to assume that something we reasoned out last year is still valid today.

This is a terrible offense in the eyes of youth. They put a lot more emphasis on change than we do. That doesn't necessarily mean that they are always right and we are always wrong. But it does mean that we have to continually explain our reasons, and do it well.

We must join the younger generation in seeking an inquiring mind rather than a closed mind; in pursuing understanding rather than acting by rote; and welcoming technical innovation rather than sticking to the same old ways of doing things.

But there is also another aspect to the generation gap, one in which I hope the younger generation will choose to join us. We must convince them that the institutions we have built in this country should not be destroyed but should be perfected, and that we have many basic values that are worth preserving.

The ROTC program provides us with officers who have technological expertise, broad understanding, and intellectual curiosity. But just as important, they are men who share key professional military values. They understand that honor and integrity is mandatory in a man who is entrusted with the security of his nation and the lives of his fellow citizens. They have thought about and accepted an attitude of basic devotion to the United States. Clearly the ROTC program makes an essential contribution to our national welfare and safety.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

On behalf of AFA, our warmest thanks to Chief Warrant Officer Bob Bunton and his magnificent Airmen of Note. As always, you have been terrific.

To all members of the United States Air Force—wherever you may be... Happy Birthday!

Well, that's it... For the rest of the night everybody—like the Air Force—is 22 years of age. Let the music play... and we'll dance across the generation gap.

THE SST AND THE WORLD MARKET

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 1969

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, it has not yet been 11 years since the first commercial jet service began in the United States. In that time the jet has revised our concepts of time and distance, revolutionized air transportation, and significantly changed our way of life as well. Now the availability of supersonic jet travel promises to further extend the "speed limits" and the economic impact of the jet revolution—particularly in terms of the international market.

The total revenue passenger miles flown by the world's airlines will have doubled between 1965 and 1970, and are expected to increase five times by 1980 to a total of 630 billion. The international passenger revenue miles flown by U.S. airlines alone are predicted to reach 91 billion by 1980, 10 billion more revenue passenger miles than the domestic market achieved by U.S. airlines in 1968. Transpacific traffic will increase sixfold, and travel to the Far East, Australia, and the South Pacific islands will quintuple.

If the public demand for air transportation increases at a rate of only 10 percent a year—and the increases have been averaging 17 percent in recent years—there will be a world market for some 500 large supersonic transports for use over international routes. This is a market the U.S. SST is well designed to serve.

By moving ahead with the SST prototype development and construction program, President Nixon has indicated his continuing confidence in the aviation in-

dustry of this country to produce superior commercial aircraft to supply the world market. The sale of 500 SST aircraft by 1990 is a \$20 billion proposition, with the continued leadership of the United States in the sale of aviation products at stake.

As President Nixon said in urging go-ahead development of the SST prototype, the supersonic transport will bring the countries of the world closer together. From New York to London will be less than 3 hours' flying time. New York to Rio will be under 5 hours. The west coast will be as close to Australia as the east coast is to Europe today. No two major cities on the globe will be more than 12 hours apart.

Jets have been responsible, in large part, for the growth of international markets, and for opening up new avenues of trade and commerce. The supersonic jet will put tomorrow's business executive closer to his customer—the tourist closer to his vacation site. Supersonic flight will eventually mean faster delivery of high-value products, and the shortening of management channels in the affairs of business.

The SST is an investment of great potential reward—a project that will reach deep into the economic and technical future of our country. I applaud President Nixon's decision to build an SST that will fully satisfy the looming market for a safe, superior, economically profitable faster-than-sound airplane.

THE SST AND INTERNATIONAL COMPETITION

Four out of five commercial jetliners in use throughout the world today are American-made, and aviation products represent one of the few remaining manufacturing fields in which the United States still enjoys an export advantage.

That advantage is being threatened today by efforts on the part of the French, British, and Russians to capture the supersonic transport market. Prototype supersonic transport aircraft are being flown in each of these countries, and 70 orders already have been placed for the Concorde. About half of these, I might mention, are ticketed for U.S. airlines.

The U.S. objective always has been to produce a superior SST—superior in terms of speed, range, and travel comfort; and superior also in its profitability for the airlines, by offering greater travel comfort for passengers traveling the world's airways.

The SST designed by the Boeing Co. and now under development as the 2707-300 will have direct operating costs comparable to today's largest 707 and, if passenger load factors are only slightly better than the industry average, will compete favorably in cost efficiencies with the "jumbo" jets. With the added speed of the U.S. SST and its greater productivity—more trips per day—the option of supersonic travel over the long haul international routes should appeal to airline operators and travelers alike.

The SST will fit ideally into the air transportation market of the late 1970's and 1980's, when the international jet travel market is forecast to be as large as the total jet travel market today.

The President's timely decision to pro-

ceed with the prototype SST program assures the United States of a substantial share of the world market for supersonic transports. To delay the program or to defer it for any reason would be to forfeit that market to the competition, and to surrender also this Nation's leadership in commercial aviation and the economic benefits that flow from that leadership.

N. E. Halaby, president of Pan American Airways, has put the matter in perspective. He recently said:

The supersonics are coming—as surely as tomorrow. You will be flying one version or another by 1980 and be trying to remember what the great debate was all about. Who was it who said that if man was meant to fly he would have been born with wings? An antecedent, perhaps, of the same man who now says that man should fly just so fast and no faster.

We have always had doubters in our society, I am sure the debate on this important question will be no different.

However, I want to make, in conclusion, this one compelling point.

In a nuclear age, a defense posture, by itself, will not provide or guarantee security for ourselves and freedom's cause in this rapidly changing technological era.

What is needed, in my judgment, is an airborne freedom ideological offensive by accelerating the economic integration with our free world friends—the SST and the jumbo jets can and will enhance our worldwide air marketing capabilities. This is the way to achieve security for our free way of life in the future.

PATRIOTISM AND FAITH

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we have so much turmoil, it is well to recognize the patriotism of the Americans who have made this country great; who have accepted their sacrifices with an abiding faith.

Mr. and Mrs. Jack Malone, Fulton, Miss., gave up their only son, James A. Malone, in World War II. Mrs. Malone has expressed so well her feelings that I consider it a privilege to have it placed in the RECORD for all to see:

GREATNESS OF GOD

I will build my hope on the Greatness of God.
Out into the depth of His love
I will put my trust in the God above;
And not in the weakness of man.

I will work by faith and not by sight.
I will look for the things unseen.

I will lean on the Arm that never fails,
And not on the weakness of man.

I live and work and do my best
And trust in God for all the rest.
I will scatter sunshine all the way
To brighten up life's cloudy days.

And when my race on earth is run
And my new life in Heaven begun,
I will know then, as I am known,
The happy faces of Dear Ones gone on.

Mrs. JACK MALONE,
(nee Gertrude McCamey).

GO WEST YOUNG MAN

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 24, 1969

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, Horace Greeley's admonition "Go West Young Man" continues to spark the imagination. More and more urbanites are fleeing from the asphalt jungles to the mountains and plains of the West. The arterial links to civilization from these remote places has made it possible for a businessman to live out in the "sticks" and either travel via the new Interstate Highway System or in the comfort of a jet to his place of business.

I recently met with a group of businessmen, all in the higher income brackets—making more than \$50,000 a year. The unanimous consensus of opinion among these men was that they had to get away from it—"it" being the rat-race—and seek rest and relaxation several times a year. All but one had been to the West, and all of them had been to Europe. Once again, a consensus—the West was the place to go. Wide open, rough, free, clean air, and few people. These men are not alone in their thinking, and it is the opinion of the editors of the U.S. News & World Report—pages 49-50, September 29—that more people than ever will make the trek westward during the coming decade of the seventies.

U.S. News & World Report predicts that the Far West, which includes Alaska, will increase in population 22 percent by 1979. Of course, California and Hawaii make up much of this increase. However, the presently isolated States in the Rocky Mountain area, including my native State of Montana, are expected to increase 14 percent during the same period. This is the second largest percentage increase in the Nation. Another set of statistics showing that the people moving to these areas mean to set up permanent house-keeping reveals that the number of households will increase in the Far West 36 percent, and in the Rocky Mountain area 32 percent, by 1979.

Why? Oil, minerals, and recreation promise to spur growth in the Rocky Mountain area. Also, the national parks throughout the entire region are attracting more and more people each year. The Far West speaks for itself. California and Hawaii continue as the recreation spots in the Nation. What about Alaska? The recent events at Prudhoe Bay have sparked more interest in the West than any event since the days of the gold rushes.

Last week 179 tracts of land—450,858 acres—put on the auction block netted the State of Alaska about \$900 million. It is believed that 10 billion barrels of oil may gush out of this vastness. First indications constitute Prudhoe as the greatest oil find in North America. Not only will Alaska prosper, but the coming boom will also mean more business for the entire Northwest, a major supplier to the 49th State.

More people, more jobs, more houses, more roads, more, more, more. The

Northwestern Continental United States is finally emerging out of its isolationism with the advent of the Interstate Highway System and the construction of jetports. However, it still faces furious competition in the commercial markets, but it is nowhere as isolated as Alaska.

Imagine a State of the United States; the wealthiest State, the largest State, one of the most beautiful States, isolated except for the air and sea routes. We can excuse this condition in Hawaii since it is an island. For a lifetime, "North to Alaska" has meant traveling along a dusty road for some 1,500 miles from Dawson Creek, British Columbia, to the border of Alaska. For 20 years, a small group of people have worked to save the Alaska Highway, predicting that a day would come when we would be embarrassed to ask: "Why wasn't it paved before?" This small group has now grown, and involves people from all walks of life. As one of that group, I have introduced a bill to pave the Alaska Highway (H.R. 13128). Hearings before the Public Works Subcommittee on Roads, should be scheduled in the next few weeks, and I sincerely hope that the response will justify the years of work by the proponents.

The reasons for paving the "Alaska Highway" have increased one by one over the years, but I submit that the oil discovery far outshines all other reasons. With the oil discovery has come an acute housing shortage, recently noted by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This is caused, the Department stated, because of the influx of workers and tourists. With more people, and almost a status quo in the commerce supply, prices continue to skyrocket. The sea routes and the airways are backlogged with priorities. The answer—a land route.

It is my sincere hope that some of the oil or the oil money gushing from Alaska will be used to pave the "Highway." Surely, the oil companies and all of Alaska will benefit tremendously from a completed land route. Today, it costs almost \$700,000 to fly an oil rig to Prudhoe. By land, that figure would be greatly reduced. By land, the cost of almost everything could be reduced.

Alaska and western Canada have a lot to offer, the "Lower 48" have a lot to share. Let us begin another "giant step for mankind."

A DISTINGUISHED TEXAN RETIRES

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on September 1, 1969, Rear Adm. John Harlee, USN, retired, resigned his duties as Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission. His resignation marked the close of another chapter in a career of dedicated public service that spanned four decades.

Admiral Harlee is a native Texan, a descendant of our pioneer stock. Both

sides of his family hold distinguished places in Texas history. His grandfather was Judge Zachary Taylor Fulmore, county judge of Travis County, the county in which the State capital is located. In commemoration to his contributions to the community, a junior high school in Austin proudly bears his name. George C. Childress, the admiral's great uncle, was the author of the Texas Declaration of Independence.

Before coming to the Federal Maritime Commission in 1961, Admiral Harlee compiled a distinguished war record which earned him, among other honors, the Silver Star and the Legion of Merit awards. After being a member of the Commission for only 2 years, Admiral Harlee was named its Chairman—truly a great honor for so junior a member.

During his 16 years as Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, the admiral was the recipient of many well-deserved honors, which reflected the high quality of leadership he provided the Commission.

All Texans and all Americans can be justly proud of such a man.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE CAUSES AND PREVENTION OF VIOLENCE

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence has, through its chairman, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, issued its report on violence in television entertainment programs.

The distinguished gentleman from Ohio, WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH, and I serve as the Members of the House of Representatives on the Commission. We believe the report merits the consideration of all our colleagues and insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for reading.

The report stresses the importance of safeguarding our greatest resource—our children. Yet we found that we daily expose these same children to violence that is contrary to civilization.

In the report we note the recent favorable trend toward less violent programs but we reiterate our call for continued improvement in programming?

The report follows:

VIOLENCE IN TELEVISION ENTERTAINMENT PROGRAMS

(NOTE.—This statement is for use after the press conference of Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, Chairman of the Commission, on or after Tuesday, September 23, 1969 (exact time and place to be announced).)

The mass media are an integral part of the daily life of virtually every American. Among these media the youngest, television, is the most pervasive. Ninety-five percent of American homes have at least one TV set, and on the average that set is in use for about 40 hours each week. The central place of television in American life makes this medium the focal point of a growing national concern over the effects of media portrayals of violence on the values, attitudes, and behavior of an ever-increasing audience.

Commercial television occasionally offers the American public some of the finest in classical and contemporary drama, music, and entertainment, excellent documentaries and panel discussions on subjects of cultural and social interest, and it regularly brings the nation together with its skilled coverage of major political events and such exploits as the Apollo space flights. But many of television's entertainment programs feature violence, and this Commission has received from the general public more suggestions, strong recommendations and often bitter complaints about violence on television than about any other single issue.

We approach this question with great care. In our concern about violence and its causes, it is easy to make television a scapegoat. But we reemphasize what we said in our Progress Report last January: there is no simple answer to the problem of violence—no single explanation of its causes, and no single prescription for its control. We urge that those who read our statement do so carefully, without exaggeration of its findings, remembering that America also experienced high levels of crime and violence in periods before the advent of television.

The problems of balance, taste, and artistic merit in entertainment programs on television are complex. We cannot countenance government censorship of television. Nor would we seek to impose arbitrary limitations on programming which might jeopardize television's ability to deal in dramatic presentations with controversial social issues. Nonetheless, we are deeply troubled by television's constant portrayal of violence, not in any genuine attempt to focus artistic expression on the human condition, but rather in pandering to a public preoccupation with violence that television itself has helped to generate.

Experience with pervasive mass communications—and particularly television—is so recent that at present there is much that is not fully understood and little that is proven beyond a reasonable doubt about the full social impact of the mass media. It is difficult to design studies linking human behavior or personality formation to media content, in view of the vast array of other variables in the social environment that converge to shape a person's conduct and values. Television is but one powerful element in a complex nexus of social forces impinging on people's lives. Consequently, we have seen our principal task as being one of clarifying the issues surrounding the problem of television violence and its effects, weighing the evidence in light of the risks of continuing the recent volume and style of violence portrayed on television, and framing recommendations appropriate to a problem that is as yet imperfectly understood.

We do not and cannot answer all of the questions raised by television programs that contain violence. But we do believe that our findings are adequate to support the recommendations which we offer to the broadcasting industry, to the government, and to the public. Questions of social policy can rarely be resolved beyond a reasonable doubt—but when we know enough to act, there is no excuse for inaction.

I

Who watches television and what they see

Everyone knows that Americans spend a great deal of time before their television sets. A number of studies described in testimony¹ before this Commission suggest, however, that we are even heavier television users than we commonly realize.

A typical, middle-income, American male devotes a total of about five hours a day to the mass media. The most popular medium is television. His TV set is in use for six

hours a day and he himself watches about two and one-half hours each weekday. He also listens to the radio about two hours each day, mostly outside his home, and he reads the newspaper for about 30 minutes each day. Movies and magazines are negligible consumers of his time: he has probably read or looked through a magazine in the last week, but he only goes to a movie every three or four months.

Low income adults are even heavier viewers of television: one survey indicates that the adults in low income homes watch television for an average of more than five hours each day. The low income adult reads the newspaper less frequently and less intensely than the average middle-class citizen, and for most low income adults it has been six months or more since they saw a movie.

All surveys indicate that children and adolescents are the heaviest viewers of television. Depending on their particular social stratum, children and adolescents spend on an average anywhere from one-fourth to as much as one-half of their waking day before a television screen—as much or more than the time that they spend in school.

One study of 15 to 17-year-olds found that on Sunday the middle-class youngsters watch television for four hours while the low income youngsters watch it for upwards of five to six hours.

Another study of fourth and fifth graders found that the lower income children watched television from five to seven hours each weekday.

Moreover, some children watch television late into the evening hours: a Nielsen study showed many evening shows having a larger number of two to five year olds watching than did any daytime show and over five million children under age twelve still watching between 10:30 and 11 p.m. one Monday night.²

The time spent by adults and children watching television today is greater than what it was a decade ago.³ Adults, for example, report watching one-half hour more television each day in 1968 than they did in 1961 and studies of children's viewing time indicate a substantial increase in 1968 over the two to four per day reported in the late 1950's.

That there is a great deal of violence on television is clear to everyone. In an effort to specify how much and what kind, we have examined the results of the numerous analyses that have been made of the content of television programs.

Much relevant evidence is to be found in testimony presented in hearings before the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency in 1955, 1961, and 1964. Some of these studies counted the number and kinds of violent acts on television, finding, for example, in a week of television watching in New York City in 1953, an average of 6.2 acts or threats of violence per one-hour program. Another study in 1962 compared the occurrence of "aggressive episodes" to the concurrence of "protective and affectionate" behavior, finding a four to one ratio of assault to affection. Other studies considered the proportion of total television fare represented by programs featuring violence. One such analysis suggested that the percentage of prime time "action and adventure" programs approximately tripled between 1954 and 1961, reaching the point where such programs constituted between one-half and two-thirds of all programs in the 7 to 10 p.m. time span. (Further analyses in 1964 showed no change in the offerings of television stations in several large cities, despite a substantial reduction of violent-format programs by CBS in the period between 1962 and 1964).⁴

More recent studies have tried to refine the analysis of television content by considering the extent to which violence is used as a means of problem-solving in television drama. Thus, in a study published in 1963

Footnotes at end of article.

one group of researchers classified program goals and examined what methods were used to obtain these goals.⁴ They found that violent means predominated: in children's shows for example, violent means were used 47% of the time, with "escape" and non-legal means short of violence adding another 15%. The researchers concluded that methods that are not socially approved seem to be portrayed in television content as having a better chance of achieving the desired goal than those methods which are socially approved.

Under the auspices of our Media Task Force, this Commission had an independent analysis made of all dramatic television programs presented by the three major commercial television networks during the prime children's and adults' viewing time (4 to 10 p.m.) on weekdays and Sunday and on Saturday mornings in the week of October 1 through 7, 1968 and in the same week in 1967.⁵ This study attempted not only to measure in a number of different ways the amount of violence in network dramatic programs but also, and more importantly, to present a picture of the kind of world in which television violence occurs. Some of the findings of this study are here summarized:

In both 1967 and 1968 approximately eight out of every ten dramatic programs contained some violence.⁶ On the other hand, the total number of violent episodes in the study week declined by nearly one-fifth between the two years (from 478 to 394).⁷ This decline somewhat exceeded the decline in the total number of hours of dramatic programs (from 64 to 58.5); accordingly, the rate of violent episodes per hour showed a decline from 7.5 in 1967 to 6.7 in 1968.

Of the crime, western, and action-adventure programs comprising about two-thirds of the networks' dramatic programs in both 1967 and 1968, virtually all contained violence in both years. Similarly, in both years they averaged about nine episodes per hour.

Cartoon programs comprised only about ten percent of the total hours of dramatic programs, but they were almost entirely concentrated in the children's programs on Saturday morning. Almost all the cartoon programs contained violence, and the rate of violent episodes was quite high in both years—more than twenty per hour.

Three-fourths of all violent programs and nearly nine out of every ten violent episodes were found in the crime, western, action-adventure category. Analysis of all program categories showed that eight out of every ten violent episodes occurred in a serious or sinister context. Overtly humorous intent (slapstick, sham, satirical) could be observed in only two out of every ten violent episodes in all program categories. Comparing the 1968 study week with that from 1967, however, there did appear to be a shift of perhaps one in every ten violent episodes out of the "serious" category into the "humorous" category.

The programs of each of the three major commercial networks contributed in different ways to the overall level of violence on television, depending on the measure of violence which is used. ABC's dramatic programs, for example, contained the greatest number of violent episodes in 1967, but that network significantly reduced the number of such episodes and in the 1968 study week was lowest in total number. In both years, however, ABC led in the percentage of dramatic program hours containing violence. CBS was least violent by this measure; but it slightly increased that percentage in 1968, and it substantially increased the rate of violent episodes per program hour. In the 1968 study week, NBC had the greatest number of violent episodes, and taking the two study years together, NBC was the leader in the amount of time devoted to programs in the category of crime, western, action-adventure.

What these findings confirm is that as of 1968 the viewing public was still being exposed to a high level of televised violence. What was the nature of this violence? What were the moral and social values explicit or implicit in the context within which the violence was portrayed?

Violent encounters in televised drama, unlike violent encounters in real life, are rarely between intimates. They generally occur at close range between young to middle-aged single males who, half the time, are strangers to each other. Six times out of ten, the violent acts involve the use of weapons; equally often, the act evokes no counter-violence from the victim.

More than half of all the leading characters in the programs (241 out of 455 identified in the two sample weeks) inflict violence in some form upon other persons. Most of these violent encounters (eight out of ten) are between clearly identified "good guys" and "bad guys." The violence is initiated about equally by each type, so that the distinction between "good" and "bad" is not determined by the use of violence.

Those who commit acts of violence more often perceive them to be in their self-interest than in the service of some other cause. Nearly half of all the leading characters who kill (25 of 54) and more than half of all leading characters who are violent (126 of 241) achieve a clearly happy ending in the programs. To this extent, violence is portrayed as a successful means of attaining a desired end.

Half of all violent episodes do not involve witnesses. When present, witnesses are usually passive and either do not or cannot intervene. In the rare instance in which a witness does intervene, it is as often to encourage or assist violence as it is to prevent it. To this extent, violence is not shown to be unacceptable in the immediate social context of the world of television drama.

Lawful arrest and trial are indicated as a consequence of major acts of violence in only two out of every ten violent programs. But the question of legality seldom arises because in the world of television violence is usually presented outside of any relevant legal context.

Physical pain—details of physical injury or death—is shown to be a consequence of violence in only one out of every four violent acts. In television drama violence does not hurt too much, nor are its consequences very bloody or messy, even though it may lead to injury or death.

In summary, then, television portrays a world in which "good guys" and "bad guys" alike use violence to solve problems and achieve goals. Violence is rarely presented as illegal or socially unacceptable. Indeed, as often as not, it is portrayed as a legitimate means for attaining desired ends. Moreover, the painful consequences of violence are underplayed and de-emphasized by the "sanitized" way in which much of it is presented.

The findings of this analysis are now a year old. Network officials testifying before this Commission last December told us that it takes about 18 months for programming decisions to be reflected in network schedules. Thus, the test of network intentions to reduce violence on television, as these were expressed in the spring and summer of 1968, can properly begin with this year's television season.

II

What are the effects of television violence?

Each year advertisers spend \$2½ billion in the belief that television can influence human behavior. The television industry enthusiastically agrees with them, but nonetheless contends that its programs of violence do not have any such influence. The preponderance of the available research evidence strongly suggests, however, that vio-

lence in television programs can and does have adverse effects upon audiences—particularly child audiences.

Television enters powerfully into the learning process of children and teaches them a set of moral and social values about violence which are inconsistent with the standards of a civilized society. As a child matures physically, he also undergoes a process of social preparation for adult roles. Much of this preparation ordinarily takes place through primary interaction with other people—in the family, in play groups, and in school. It goes on all the time the child is awake and active, even when neither he nor the persons with whom he interacts are consciously concerned with shaping his character. What he becomes is a result of his genetic endowment, his environment, what he has done, and what he has learned.

Reward and punishment, trial and error—i.e., the responses that a child's behavior elicits—are significant sources of social learning in the early years of childhood. But as the child grows older, he learns increasingly more from what he observes in the behavior of others. His own behavior is shaped by observation of the successes and failures and the rewards and punishments meted out to those around him. In short, he learns by vicarious reinforcement.

Children turn to television primarily for entertainment, relaxation, or relief of boredom and loneliness. Despite the relative passivity of these motivations, a process of incidental "observational learning" takes place. A child's observational learning from television depends on a number of factors. One is the degree to which the child can identify with a TV character. Another is the extent to which he perceives utility for his own purposes in the behavioral or informational items portrayed. A third factor is his belief that learning and acting on the item will succeed in producing gratifications sought. Younger children, between the ages of three and eight, are particularly susceptible to observational learning when the material portrayed is new to them and therefore absorbs their attention. Because the life-experiences of younger children are narrow and limited, most of what they see on television is, of course, unfamiliar to them. Finally, the "reality" of the portrayal affects observational learning. What younger children see on television is peculiarly "real," for they are still in the process of learning to discriminate between fantasy and reality.

As they get older, children bring somewhat more purposeful motivations to their television viewing, even when they are primarily seeking entertainment. Many adolescents consciously rely on mass media models in learning to play real-life roles. In particular, they obtain ideas and advice about dating and behavior toward the opposite sex. This is especially true of those adolescents who are not well integrated into family and school life and who rely more heavily on the mass media for social learning because more conventional sources are not available. Television is a primary source of socialization for low-income teenagers. In the absence of family, peer, and school relationships, television becomes the most compatible substitute for real-life experiences.

One reason that children are inclined to learn from television is that it provides "the most accessible back door to the grown-up world."⁸ It is never too busy to talk to them, and it never has to brush them aside while it does household chores. Unlike their pre-occupied parents, television seems to want their attention at any time, and goes to considerable lengths to attract it. The image of the adult world which most children get from television drama is by and large an unwholesome one, but it is at least an image they find available when they may not have access to the guidance of parents. Indeed, parents too often use the television set as a

Footnotes at end of article.

baby-sitter, and for many this is an abdication of their parental responsibility to instill proper values in their children.

Moreover, as we have said, many young children are inclined to believe that the world they see portrayed on television is a reflection of the real world. The ability to differentiate between fact and fiction naturally increases with age and maturity, but it also appears to be a function of the child's particular social environment. Of teenagers asked whether they agreed or disagreed with such statements as: "The programs I see on television tell about life the way it really is" and "The people I see on TV programs are just like the people I meet in real life," 40 percent of the poor black adolescents and 30 percent of the poor whites strongly believed in the true-to-life nature of television content, as compared with only 15 percent of the middle class white youngsters. In short, young children and a large proportion of teenagers from low income families believe that people behave in the real world the way they do in the fictional world of television.

These findings are hardly surprising. Because of its apparent fidelity to reality, its vividness, its simultaneous appeal to both vision and hearing, television seems intrinsically authentic and credible, whether it presents fact or fancy. It requires some intellectual maturity or breadth of experience on the part of a youngster to discount what he sees and hears.

A large body of research on observational learning by pre-school children (described in testimony before this Commission and in the staff report of our Mass Media Task Force) confirms that children can and do learn aggressive behavior from what they see in a film or on a TV screen, and that they learn it equally from real life and fantasy (cartoon) models. They retain what they learn for several months if they practice the aggressive response at least once, and their re-enactment of such learned behavior is, in large part, determined by the perceived rewards and punishments meted out to the models they have observed.

Some defenders of violence on television, however, contend that viewers "drain off" aggressive tendencies by their vicarious participation in violent media programs. According to this reasoning, the mass media serve a socially useful "cathartic" function: by displaying violence they provide harmless outlets for the violent impulses of audience members and thereby prevent overt actions that would be socially undesirable.

Laboratory experiments on the reactions of adults and teenagers to violent film content provide little support for this theory. In fact, the vast majority of experimental studies on this question have found that observed violence stimulates aggressive behavior, rather than the opposite. Moreover, the stimulation of aggressive responses from exposure to filmed aggression is more likely to occur when the witnessed aggression occurs in a justified rather than in an unjustified context. Further experimental elaboration has shown that stimulation of aggression is most likely when the context of the film is similar to the viewer's perception of his own situation.

The psychiatric and psychological literature suggests other emotional effects that may be associated with exposure to media violence. In particular, there is reason to believe that repeated exposure to media violence may have the effect not only of dulling the audience's emotional reactions to fictional violence, but may also desensitize viewers to violence in real life and, thus, make them more willing actually to engage in aggressive actions when provoking circumstances arise. On the other hand, exposure to particularly horrifying episodes focusing on the painful results of violence may possibly have just the opposite effect by sensitizing viewers to the potential harm that they themselves might inflict.

We believe it is reasonable to conclude that a constant diet of violent behavior on television has an adverse effect on human character and attitudes. Violence on television encourages violent forms of behavior, and fosters moral and social values about violence in daily life which are unacceptable in a civilized society.

We do not suggest that television is a principal cause of violence in society. We do suggest that it is a contributing factor. Television, of course, operates in a complex social setting and its effects are undoubtedly mitigated by other social influences. But it is a matter for grave concern that at a time when the values and the influence of traditional institutions such as family, church, and school are in question, television is emphasizing violent, antisocial styles of life.

Although the negative values imparted by television can be ameliorated by parental influence, our concern over television violence is not diminished by this fact. In the first place, surveys have found that while most parents wish to eliminate programs of crime, violence, and horror from their children's television diet, only a tiny fraction of these believe that they can actually keep their children from watching such programs. The practical problems of monitoring children's television habits are too great in the face of the pervasiveness of televised crime and violence. Further, television may reduce or even counteract parental influence. Children daily see acts committed on television for which they have been or would be punished, while the actors often appear to go unpunished and even to be rewarded.

Moreover, television is a particularly potent force in families where parental influences and primary group ties are weak or completely lacking, notably in low-income areas or where violent life-styles are common. In these instances, television does not displace parental influence: it fills a vacuum. The strong preference of low-income teenagers for crime, action, and adventure stories means that they are constantly exposed to the values of violent television programs without the ameliorating moral influence of their parents. This is a fact of considerable social importance, especially in light of the large amounts of time low-income youngsters spend with television and the high credence they place in what they watch. The television experience of these children and adolescents reinforces a distorted, pathological view of society.⁹

III

What should be done?

The television industry has consistently argued that its standards for the portrayal of violence and its machinery for enforcement of these standards are adequate to protect the public interest. We do not agree. The inadequacy of the standards and the enforcement machinery may be briefly stated.

The National Association of Broadcasters' Code, to which the three networks and some two-thirds of the nation's commercial television stations subscribe, sets overall industry standards for the portrayal of violence. These standards are aimed primarily at screening out material that might alarm audiences or offend their sensibilities. This deference to public taste, while better than nothing at all, results in an essentially cosmetic approach to the portrayal of violence which does not get to the heart of the problem.

The NAB Code's standards for children's programs—that portrayal of the "techniques of crime in such detail as to invite imitation" should be avoided and that violence should be portrayed only as "required by plot development or character delineation"—do not begin to meet the issues we have discussed.

Despite the existence of some generalizations on the subject, the NAB Code notably omits any meaningful standards relating to the crucial issue of providing suitably balanced program fare—that is, reducing the number of programs which, because of their basic format, require the use of violence as the basic mode of conflict resolution.

In any event, although two of the three networks now submit programs in advance to the NAB for clearance under NAB standards, the primary responsibility for screening program content rests, as it properly should, upon the networks and individual stations themselves. ABC, CBS, and NBC each has standards similar to the NAB Code and each has a Program Standards and Practices Department with authority independent of other divisions to review scripts, roughcuts, and final films to assure adherence to NAB and network standards. As with the NAB, however, the Program Standards and Practices Departments have no responsibility for determining program mix or format in the network schedule; they concern themselves only with the manner in which violence is portrayed in particular programs.

Although all of the networks say that they are keeping abreast of current research on the effects of violence on viewers, until recently none of them has conducted research on its own, and each has taken the position that the research others have done is wholly inconclusive. As one network official put it: "There are many conflicting points of view on the influence of the media on human behavior and there is no conclusive research on which appropriate guidelines can be based." We are informed that the networks are now beginning to conduct their own research on the effects of programs containing violence, but at present network standards on violence are based on essentially subjective interpretations of audience tastes and on what is considered appropriate to television's role as a "guest in the home."

We believe that the television networks, network affiliates, independent stations, and other members of the broadcasting industry should recognize the strong probability that a high incidence of violence in entertainment programs is contributing to undesirable attitudes and even to violence in American society. It is time for them to stop asserting "not proved" to charges of adverse effects from pervasive violence in television programming when they should instead be accepting the burden of proof that such programs are not harmful to the public interest. Much remains to be learned about media violence and its effects, but enough is known to require that constructive action be taken at once to reduce the amount and alter the kind of violent programs which have pervaded television.

We offer four recommendations to all the members of the television industry:

1. The broadcasting of children's cartoons containing serious, non-comic violence should be abandoned. The cartoons broadcast by the networks on Saturday morning during the 1967-68 and 1968-69 seasons were the most intensively violent programs on television, with perhaps the least amount of redeeming constructive value. We note that the networks have effected substantial improvements in the cartoon programs offered this season. We urge that these improvements be maintained in coming seasons, and we urge affiliates and independent stations to refrain from broadcast of violent cartoons produced in prior years.

2. The amount of time devoted to the broadcast of crime, western and action-adventure programs containing violent episodes should be reduced. We include here full-length motion-pictures shown by both the networks and independent television stations. It is especially these kinds of programs in which the problems faced by the characters almost inevitably call for violent

Footnotes at end of article.

solutions, and thus it is these programs which most distort the nature of life in civilized society. In particular, we recommend that programs of this type be restricted to the late viewing hours when fewer very young children are watching television.

With respect to this recommendation, we note that the networks' 1969-70 program schedule seems to indicate the beginning of a favorable trend along the lines recommended here. We welcome this trend and urge its continuation.

3. More effective efforts should be made to alter the basic context in which violence is presented in television dramas. When the resort to violence is depicted as an unusual and undesirable outcome, the context is sharply different from the world of contemporary television in which violence has been the routine method by which people solve problems. It may be simpler to write scripts and shoot film where confrontations are resolved by violence, but it is just these artistically and dramatically inferior programs that are probably doing the most damage.

4. The members of the television industry should become more actively and seriously involved in research on the effects of violent television programs, and their future policies, standards, and practices with regard to entertainment programs should be more responsive to the best evidence provided by social scientists, psychologists, and communications researchers. Although we believe in the desirability of further research and thus urge continuing cooperation with such valuable efforts as the current Surgeon General's study of television violence, we re-emphasize our conclusion that enough is known to make inexcusable any delay in taking action along the lines we have recommended. In this regard, we especially urge the Surgeon General's committee and independent research groups to undertake regular analyses of television program content for the purpose of ascertaining whether a reduction in televised violence is being carried through, both by the networks and by the local stations.

We note that an effective response by the television industry to our recommendations may require some measure of joint action by the industry members. To the extent that cooperative action is necessary in the public interest, we are confident that appropriate antitrust clearances will be provided.

We offer one recommendation to the President and the Congress:

Adequate and permanent financing, in the form of a dedicated tax, should be provided for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting so that it may develop the kind of educational, cultural, and dramatic programming not presently provided in sufficient measure by commercial broadcasting.

We believe, as the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 states, "that it furthers the general welfare to encourage noncommercial educational radio and television broadcast programming which will be responsive to the interests of people both in particular localities and throughout the United States, and which will constitute an expression of diversity and excellence," and "that it is necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to complement, assist, and support a national policy that will most effectively make non-commercial radio and television service available to all the citizens of the United States." We suggest financing by means of a dedicated tax, because we believe that public television must be free from the political pressures that result from the need for annual federal appropriations.

Public broadcasts can be a much needed alternative to commercial programs. It is generally assumed that commercial television caters to the public taste. But television also creates the public taste. In a wide range of wholesome entertainment and public service programs is offered as an alternative to the current fare of entertainment violence, it is

likely that this will effect changes in public tastes and ultimately make violent television programs less commercially attractive. But this longer-term possibility does not relieve commercial television of the responsibility to reduce now the volume and change the character of its violent programs.

We offer the following recommendations to the viewing public and especially to parents:

1. Parents should make every effort to supervise their children's television viewing and to assert their basic responsibility for the moral development of their children.

2. The viewing public should express to the networks and to the local stations both their disapproval of programs which they find objectionable and their support for programs they like. We believe that most families do not want large doses of violence on television, and thus we urge them to make the weight of their opinion felt.

Finally, we add a special word on motion pictures produced for initial showing in theaters. Movies have not been a focal point of this Commission's studies because children spend a far smaller part of their lives in motion picture theaters than before television sets. Motion pictures, however, often portray more extreme forms of violence and we cannot ignore their potential for harm.

The motion picture industry has adopted a new voluntary film rating system whose primary objective is to identify, and to restrict access to, pictures which are inappropriate for children because of the treatment of "sex, violence, crime or profanity." The President of the Motion Picture Association of America stated to this Commission that the success of this system will depend on how fairly pictures are rated, how responsible is the attitude of filmmakers, and how well the ratings are enforced at the box office, as well as on how much the parents of the country want it to work. We agree with this judgment, and we urge an evaluation of the effectiveness of the new movie-rating system with an emphasis on the question of the validity of the ratings as they relate to violence and the enforcement of the admission standards regarding minors.¹⁰

Of course, the motion picture rating system can solve only part of the problem. Most motion pictures, after theater exhibition, are subsequently shown on television—where there is no possibility of restricting viewing of violent pictures to adults only. As with other kinds of programs, the responsibility for not showing unsuitably violent motion pictures lies with the networks and with the affiliated and independent stations.

IV

Conclusion

We reemphasize and summarize:

Television is one of our significant national resources, but our greatest resource is our children. Children begin to absorb the lessons of television before they can read or write. In a fundamental way, television helps to create what children expect of themselves and of others, and of what constitutes the standards of civilized society. Yet, as one witness before this Commission graphically stated it, we daily permit our children during their formative years to enter a world of police interrogations, of gangsters beating enemies, of spies performing fatal brain surgery, and of routine demonstrations of all kinds of killing and maiming.

The producers of television programs have access to the imagination and knowledge of the best talents of our time to display the full range of human behavior and to present prominently and regularly what is possible and laudible in the human spirit. They have time to think and experiment, and they have the entire history of man from which to draw. Television entertainment based on violence may be effective merchandising, but it is an appalling way to serve a civilization—an appalling way to fulfill the requirements

of the law that broadcasting serve the "public interest, convenience and necessity." The recent favorable trend toward less violent program is a hopeful sign that the nation's broadcasters share this view.

SEPARATE STATEMENT OF JUDGE ERNEST W. McFARLAND

Judge McFarland, because of his interest in a television station, did not participate in the findings or approve them, but stated he recognized the television industry should continue to improve programming and help build character in the youth of our Nation and voted to approve the recommendation of the Commission.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Testimony of Professor Bradley Greenberg, Department of Communications, Michigan State University, October 16, 1968.

² Lyle, "Contemporary Functions of the Mass Media," Appendix, Report of the Mass Media Task Force of this Commission.

³ Roper Research Associates, *A Ten-Year View of Public Attitudes Toward Television and Other Mass Media 1959-1968* (March 26, 1969); Schramm, Lyle & Parker, *Television in the Lives of Our Children* (1961).

⁴ Larsen, Gray & Fortis, "Achieving Goals Through Violence On Television," in *Violence and the Mass Media* (Larsen ed. 1968).

⁵ Dramatic programs—fictional stories of all kinds—accounted for two-thirds of the program hours offered by each network between 7 and 10 p.m. in 1968, as opposed to about three-fourths of such offerings in 1967. (The remaining programs—excluded from the study—include variety shows, game shows, and news or documentary presentations.) In both 1967 and 1968 virtually no dramatic programs were offered by the networks between 4 and 7 p.m., and our study made no attempt to determine whether and to what extent dramatic programs were transmitted by local stations during this time period.

⁶ A program was defined for the purposes of this study as any discrete story unit, from a short cartoon to a full-length movie. Violence was defined as "the overt expression of force intended to hurt or kill."

⁷ A violent "episode" is a scene of whatever duration between the same violent parties—anything from a full-scale battle to a single violent encounter between two characters.

⁸ Robert Lewis Shayon, *Television and Our Children*, 1951, p. 37.

⁹ In another report, this Commission points out that in every major city the district which has the lowest level of education, the highest rate of unemployment, the poorest housing, and the highest degree of poverty is also the district with the highest rate of violent crime. These areas also have the most persistent television viewing. Here, the distinction between the use of violence on television and that in real life is less than it is in other areas.

¹⁰ We note that the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography has contracted for a study which will throw some light on these questions.

DR. SERGIO ANGELETTI

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is with a real sense of loss that I rise today to bid farewell to Dr. Sergio Angeletti, labor counselor of the Italian Embassy, who is leaving this country to return to Italy. During his all too brief term of office, he

has demonstrated a deep understanding of the problems with which he has been confronted, and has proven himself a man of high ability and integrity. His warm and friendly disposition has made his mission all the more effective, and has served to strengthen the already friendly ties between the United States and Italy.

Working under the most able and distinguished Ambassador, my dear friend Egidio Ortona, Sergio Angeletti has added substantially to Italy's representation in this country, and I am indeed sorry to see him leave. To Sergio and his charming wife and family, I bid bon voyage and "buona fortuna."

THE RESOLUTION OF UKRAINIAN ORGANIZATIONS

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress deplore the violations of religious and human rights in Ukraine that those staunch people are encountering. I, therefore, insert for the edification of my colleagues a resolution adopted by representatives of the Ukrainian Organizations of the Newark Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee, who attended a special meeting in Newark, N.J., on June 9, 1969. This group condemns the harsh treatment endured by the Ukrainian people, and asks for a legitimate and peaceful solution to put an end to it.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

We, the undersigned, the representatives of the Ukrainian Organizations under the direction of the Executives of the Newark Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, the national representative body of over 2 million Americans of Ukrainian descent, gathered at a special meeting, held on Monday, June 9, 1969, in Newark, N.J., unanimously adopted the following resolution:

Whereas, the Soviet Government destroyed the Ukrainian Autocephalic Orthodox Church in the 1930's by murdering over 30 archbishops and bishops, and over 20,000 clergy; and

Whereas, the Kremlin has ruthlessly annihilated the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Western Ukraine by arresting 11 bishops and over 2,000 Catholic priests, monks and nuns, and forced some 5 million Ukrainian Catholics into the fold of the Communist-Controlled Russian Orthodox Church against their will and conviction; and

Whereas, on January 27, 1969, the KGB has arrested in Lviv, Ukraine, Archbishop Vasyl Welychkovsky, a high-ranking prelate of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, as well as a number of other Catholic priests; and

Whereas, the Soviet government persistently harasses and persecutes Christian adherents in Ukraine by closing the houses of worship of the Baptists, Evangelicals, Jehovah's Witnesses and others; and

Whereas, the government of the Soviet Union has been engaged in a relentless policy of russification in Ukraine by imposing the Russian language and culture, and by arresting, trying and deporting Ukrainian intellectuals for their loyalty to and defense of

the Ukrainian culture and national heritage; and

Whereas, the Soviet government is guilty of flagrant and systematic violations of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, to which it has been an official signatory, particularly Art. 18 of the said Declaration, which provides for the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion, as well as Art. 2 and 15 which provide for the equality of all races and nationalities.

Now, therefore, we hereby unanimously resolve:

1. To dispatch this resolution to the two Senators and the U.S. Representatives from the State of New Jersey, and to members of the State Legislature of the State of New Jersey, so as to inform them about the religious, political and cultural persecution of some 46,000,000 Ukrainian people by the alien regime of Communist Russia;

2. To ask these elected representatives of the State of New Jersey to prevail upon the U.S. Government to raise at all high-level conferences with the rulers of the USSR the question of the actual negation of the right of self-determination of the Ukrainian Nation as well as all other captive nations now enslaved by the USSR and its subservient communist satellites in Europe and Asia.

Alliance of the Friends of Ukrainian Democratic Republic Branch in Newark, N.J.

American-Ukrainian Citizen Club, Inc., Newark, N.J.

Association for Free Ukraine, Inc. (O.P.W.B.U.).

Brotherhood of former Soldiers of the First Ukrainian Div. U.N.A.

Fathers' Committee of St. John Ukrainian Catholic School in Newark, N.J.

Federation of Ukrainian Student Organizations of America Branch of Newark, N.J.

Ladies Sodality.

Organization for the Defense of Lemkivshchyna Branch #5 in Newark, N.J.

Organization for the Rebirth of Ukraine (ODWU) Inc., Branch #70 in Newark, N.J.

Organization of Defense of Four Freedoms of Ukraine, Inc., Branch #1 in Newark, N.J.

"Plast" Inc. Ukrainian Youth Organization, Chapter #17.

Ridna Shkola.

Selfreliance Association.

Society of Veterans of Ukrainian Insurgent Army, Inc.

The Providence Association of the Ukrainian Catholics in America.

The Ukrainian Music Institute of America, Inc. Branch Newark, N.J.

Ukrainian-American Businessmen's Association of Newark, N.J.

Ukrainian American Youth Association, Inc.

Ukrainian Athletic Association "Chornomorska Sitch", Inc.

Ukrainian Choir Society "Trembita".

Ukrainian Community Center, Inc.

Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., Branch for Newark, N.J. and Vicinity.

Ukrainian Evangelical Baptist Church in Newark, N.J.

Ukrainian Hetman Organization of America, Inc. Branch #14 Newark, N.J.

Ukrainian National Aid Association of America, Branch #161, Newark, N.J.

Ukrainian National Association Inc., District Committee, Newark, N.J.

Ukrainian National Women's League of America, Inc., Branches #28 and #86 in Newark, N.J.

Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Holy Ascension in Newark, N.J.

Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Holy Trinity in Irvington, N.J.

Ukrainian Research and Information Institute, Inc., Branch #7 in Newark, N.J.

Ukrainian Workingmen's Association of State of New Jersey.

United Ukrainian War Veterans in America.

ECONOMIC EXPANSION THROUGH TAX INCENTIVES IS PROGRAM FOR WEST VIRGINIA

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, last January our able and distinguished colleague, Arch A. Moore, Jr., retired from the House of Representatives after 12 years of dedicated and effective service. He and I entered this Congress together and I was privileged to be his personal friend during his tenure here in the Nation's Capital.

Arch Moore could have continued to represent his district in the National Capital, but he decided to run for Governor of West Virginia instead. He was elected to that high office last November and has been an outstanding Governor since he assumed the reins in January.

A recent news release issued by the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., shows that Governor Moore has provided constructive leadership for his State. As I know that my colleagues will be interested in what Arch has done since he left this body, I am offering the federation's account for the RECORD:

An oft-repeated American aphorism is "he puts his money where his mouth is."

This expression could probably be well applied to Governor Arch Moore, Jr. of West Virginia. Before leaving Congress to become governor this year, Moore was ranking minority member of the House Small Business Committee.

In this capacity he supported many of the tax-incentive measures endorsed by the nation's independent business sector in votes conducted by the National Federation of Independent Business. And as ranking minority member of the House Small Business Committee he led his colleagues in supporting the rural redevelopment bill of Congressman Joe Evin's of Tennessee, chairman of the committee. This proposal would grant tax incentives for employment providing enterprises starting up in rural areas.

But it is perhaps one thing as a member of a supporting group, and another matter to take the same stand as a chief executive, where as former President Truman once stated, the buck stops.

Yet Governor Moore, concerned over the economic condition of West Virginia called an extraordinary session of the state legislature this summer for a principal purpose of providing tax incentives for the creation of new industry in the state, and the expansion of existing industry.

His viewpoint prevailed, with the result that West Virginia now offers substantial tax incentives to business that provides employment to its residents.

In common with many states in that area, West Virginia levies on business what is known as a business and occupation tax which is on a sliding scale, depending on volume. This is an important source of the revenue of these states. In West Virginia last year one-fifth of the state budget of \$500 million was raised from this source, or \$90 million to be exact.

The bill as passed provides for a new firm that builds facilities in the state, or an existing one that expands, to write off up to 50 percent of the business and occupation tax. The dollar investment is not used as the sale guide but rather the useful life of the facilities. If that life is eight years or longer,

the full amount of 50 percent can be taken as a tax credit. If the estimated life is 4 to 6 years one-third of this amount can be taken as a credit, with other periods of life on a proportionate scale.

The Moore proposal was enacted on July 25 and in less than a month two new employment giving industries moved into West Virginia and there are indications that many smaller enterprises already established in the state are planning expansions on the basis of this credit.

Starting with the presidential campaign of 1960, West Virginia has long been used as a case history of poverty conditions, and for several years heavy infusions of Federal money poured into the state split between a wide variety of Federal programs.

A careful analysis of the situation convinced Governor Moore that the answer to his state's problems was not to be found in Federal outlays.

Or as his press secretary Murray Yost puts it, "Too many of the Federal programs were concentrated on trying to teach the poor how to live better in poverty. The Governor feels that the only practical way to get out of poverty is to have a steady job. And this is the purpose of the tax incentive . . . to encourage more business expansion that can provide those jobs in West Virginia."

During his years on the House Small Business Committee, Governor Moore was a consistent advocate of solving economic problems through tax incentives. He was also recognized on the Hill as one of the better informed legislators on the practical problems of small business.

In 1966, he was featured on the documentary film "Small Business is Big Business" emceed by Bennett Cerf and produced through the cooperation of the National Federation of Independent Business. The film has subsequently been shown in the nation's TV markets.

The Federation legislative staff says that if he were still in Congress, the Governor would have been one of the first to have introduced an amendment to the current tax bill to provide that some part of the seven percent investment credit be retained for small business, an issue now being fought over with several Congressmen taking a stand for small and independent business.

JUSTICE FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I think that I speak for many of the Members of the House in welcoming the inclusion of an automatic cost-of-living provision in the President's social security legislation.

Since entering the Congress almost 7 years ago, I have fought for an approach to social security that meets the real needs of our senior citizens who have been left at the mercy of runaway inflation. By guaranteeing built-in protection for older Americans and establishing a fair, reasonable system of continuity for social security, we can also free it from partisan politics. Too often in the past, it has been this factor rather than the protection of those dependent on social security for their livelihood that has prompted congressional attention.

If a majority of the House will support President Nixon's cost-of-living provision, we can correct this longstanding

injustice and give our deserving senior citizens the dignity and security which has so long been denied them.

The choice is clear. I strongly urge that Congress give immediate attention to this positive measure.

BIG TRUCK BILL

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, my editorial for today is from the Arkansas Democrat in the State of Arkansas:

MONSTER TRUCK BILL IN CONGRESS AGAIN (By Karr Shannon)

The freight truck industry is persistent. The same bill which eased through the Senate last summer, only to head into a roadblock in the House, is back in Congress for another try at increasing the size and load limits of the highway boxcars.

The reason it failed in the House last year was the deluge of letters, telegrams, phone calls and personal contacts with congressmen from the people. It must be stopped again.

If it should get through both houses of Congress this time, private car owners will be encumbered with the deplorable prospect of competing for space on the nation's highways with the behemoths which could weigh over five tons and be up to 105 feet long—about five times the length of the average passenger automobile.

Lobbyists describe the bill as "permissive" since it would merely permit the several states to authorize larger trucks than allowed under present law, dating from 1956, to operate on interstate highways within their borders.

STATES ARE VULNERABLE

But states, especially Arkansas, has been vulnerable to the trucking interests. Traditionally they give the truckers about what they want. Approval of this bill by Congress would pave the way for making our highways super freight lines.

Driving conditions would become hazardous. Longer, wider and heavier (as much as 50 per cent more in weight) monsters on wheels would be allowed to roar along the nation's highways, increasing congestion of the already clogged traffic on all arteries.

The big trucks, even under the present size and weight limitations, are not paying their way on our highways. And if the truck lobby gets what it wants through the bill now before Congress the elephantine trucks will reduce the life span for many roadways and bridges, especially older ones, and will drastically increase maintenance and replacement costs for taxpaying motorists.

COST EXORBITANT

An editorial in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat says "the price is too high to pay for the convenience of any one industry." The editorial continues:

"In testimony on the bill last year, it was estimated that proposed increases in truck sizes might add up to \$3 billion in federal highway costs for strengthening roads and bridges.

"Furthermore, it was revealed that even on the interstate system there are bridges unable to take heavier loads than the standards which existed during the years they were designed.

"Making matters worse is the fact it would be impossible to restrict the big trucks to interstate highways. The monsters would have to get off the interstate routes for pickups and deliveries, rumbling over city streets

and roadways totally incapable of withstanding the pounding of the rubber-tired juggernauts . . ."

The highways in Arkansas—and in the rest of the nation, for that matter—already are inadequate for the ever-increasing traffic load, and the cost of upkeep is exorbitant, without subjecting them to the stress of heavier and longer freighters.

Trucks at present size and weight are difficult to pass, especially when two or three are tailgating ahead. And it's little short of horrifying to think of trying to pass ahead of one of the wide, 105-foot-long, 50-ton monsters, or of meeting one on a narrow roadway, or having one come up from behind and breathe down your neck for miles.

SHAMEFUL AND SELFISH

Statistically speaking, there are now approximately 80 million passenger cars in the United States, compared to about 17 million trucks of all sizes. Of this number only a small percentage classify as heavy highway freighters. So the construction and maintenance of highways is chiefly the tax burden of the some 80 million passenger cars which operate with scarcely any damage to the roadways.

The truck bill defeated last year and now before Congress again is a shameful and selfish effort toward special interest legislation.

It was defeated in the House the first time up because of the heavy pressure from "the people back home." Now is the time to get letters and telegrams to representatives in both House and Senate, urging them to vote against the truck bill.

THE NEW ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR MINORITY ENTERPRISE

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, last week in a little-noted action the President named 63 prominent Americans to serve on the new Advisory Council for Minority Enterprise.

Today, it is not my purpose to repeat those names even though, in my opinion they did not and have not received from the press the notice they deserve for volunteering to serve on this Council.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I want to take just a moment to point out that the President continues to move forward in his efforts to solve the real problems of our minorities.

He has not done it with loud fanfare or with promises easily made but seldom kept. Instead, he has done it in ways that will have long-term benefits for our entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the President has pointed out that encouraging more successful enterprise by minority group members is a vital objective of this administration. Republicans believe that every American should have the opportunity to share in the profits of our free enterprise system because we know that with each new business that comes into being we enlarge the opportunities for more new careers among our minorities.

The Office of Minority Business Enterprise was created 6 months ago in an effort to provide new opportunities. The President is determined that this long-term effort will succeed.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who continue to criticize this administration for not moving fast enough to help our minorities and our poor. But I am convinced that the real accomplishments of the Nixon administration in this area will stand head and shoulders ahead of all the talking we hear from so many of the so-called liberals.

DISRUPTERS DISCIPLINED BY COLLEGES

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in the course of our deliberations on matters involving student unrest on our Nation's campuses, we often lose sight of two facts. One, the constructive activities of many of today's students; and, two, the steps that college and university officials have taken to discipline disruptive students.

Whenever possible I have called examples of both to the attention of my colleagues.

I would like to include as part of my remarks at this point an article by Philip W. Semas which appeared in the Chronicle of Higher Education, August 11, 1969, entitled "Colleges Punish Large Numbers of Disrupters":

COLLEGES PUNISH LARGE NUMBERS OF DISRUPTERS

Colleges and universities have been much tougher on student protesters than critics give them credit for.

On 28 of the campuses that suffered disorders or demonstrations during the past academic year, more than 900 students have been expelled or suspended. More than 850 others have been given reprimands which could lead to expulsion or suspension if they commit another violation.

Some institutions, such as Stanford and the University of California at Berkeley, have collected fines from demonstrators to pay for property damage.

Six of the 28 institutions have taken no disciplinary action. In three of those, the administration agreed not to act if students would vacate buildings they were holding, thus avoiding violence.

At another institution, Columbia University, disciplinary action is still in progress. At Howard University, Dean of Students Carl Anderson has recommended that no action be taken against 14 students whose cases were dismissed by a District of Columbia judge. James E. Cheek, Howard's new president, said he was still considering possible action against them. At Cornell University, disciplinary action—if any—will not be taken until the school's disciplinary machinery is revised.

Examples of punishments handed out to protesters:

San Francisco State College expelled one student, suspended 22, put 13 on probation, and reprimanded 105. The cases of 122 students have not yet been decided.

Harvard expelled 16, put 20 on probation, and placed 99 "under warning."

Wisconsin State University at Oshkosh expelled 90 students.

The University of Kansas suspended 33 students for the fall, 1969, semester, and 13

who would have graduated in June had their credits held up until January, 1970.

The University of Chicago expelled 43 students, suspended 81, put three on probation, and fined one.

Dartmouth College suspended one student for one year, gave four students token suspensions, and placed 19 on probation. Eleven cases are still to be decided by the student-faculty discipline committee.

The University of California at Berkeley, which often has been accused of taking a lax attitude toward protesters, has dismissed 15 students, suspended 35, placed 160 on disciplinary probation, and collected \$20,000 in fines for property damage during the past year.

Some universities also are taking action against faculty members involved in disorders. Dartmouth College has suspended two faculty members for two years because of their involvement in the takeover of a building there. A Harvard committee is considering charges against three professors. San Francisco State College President S. I. Hayakawa fired Nathan Hare, chairman of the black studies department, because of his involvement in disorders on that campus.

In another case involving Mr. Hare, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia ruled that Howard University acted improperly when it fired him and four other faculty members after disorders there during 1968. The court did not question the university's right to hire and fire whomever it wished, but it did say the university should have followed normal due process.

Administrators also have been much more willing to call the police than is generally believed. Eighteen of the 28 institutions called the police. Of the 10 that didn't, six used campus disciplinary machinery to deal with the demonstrators.

FBI SAYS 4,000 ARRESTED

J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, said in his report on FBI activities during fiscal 1969 that campus disorders resulted in more than 4,000 arrests.

During these cases, courts in Ohio, New York, and Missouri have upheld the right of colleges and universities to use campus rules and disciplinary procedures to maintain order on their campuses.

Many universities also have revised their codes of conduct and campus rules, both as a result of the past year's demonstrations and in anticipation of further unrest next fall. Among the developments:

The Cornell University board of trustees adopted regulations on campus conduct at a meeting in July, as they were required to do by a new New York state law. Acting President Dale R. Corson has appointed a student-faculty-administration task force to consider possible changes in the regulations before classes begin in September, since the requirements of the law made it impossible for the trustees to consult with either faculty or students. Cornell's constituent assembly, which was formed after the disorders there, also may recommend some changes in campus rules.

The Harvard faculty of arts and sciences has adopted an interim statement on acceptable behavior for students, faculty members, and administrators. They said they hoped to develop a broader statement "in the near future."

Both the University of California and the California state colleges have made changes in their campus rules during disorders.

"UNACCEPTABLE" CONDUCT DEFINED

Among the actions most frequently classified as "unacceptable" by these rules are: Disrupting the normal, orderly functioning of the educational process;

Threatening or using physical force or violence or inciting others to use force or violence;

Obstructing access to campus buildings or other facilities;

Unlawfully entering or remaining in a building;

Damaging university property;

Interfering with free speech;

Using obscene language in speaking or on signs;

Failing to comply with a lawful order by a police officer or a university official;

Interfering with disciplinary proceedings.

Several institutions also added a rule prohibiting firearms on campus, following the publicity given the carrying of guns by students at Cornell.

MOST GUARANTEE DUE PROCESS

Most of the codes also guarantee due process to student violators, usually through some kind of student-faculty committee to hear cases. Students also usually are granted the right to be represented by counsel and to confront the witnesses against them.

The courts seem to be moving toward requiring due process in campus discipline. Judge Francis J. Good, of the Suffolk County, Mass., Superior Court, said recent developments in civil rights law have made it questionable whether "a university can make charges against a student and expel him without due process of law." In Madison, Wis., Federal District Judge James E. Doyle ruled that Oshkosh State University could not suspend or expel 94 black students without hearings.

—PHILIP W. SEMAS.

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 24, 1969

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in honoring my good friend and fellow legislator FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa.

Those of us who have been privileged to serve with FRED in the House are aware of his outstanding contributions over the years. Not only has he been an effective Congressman for Iowa's First Congressional District, but, he has done much to improve the Nation's highway system to meet the needs of our ever changing society.

I do not believe there is another Congressman who has done as much as FRED SCHWENGEL has to create a better appreciation for the U.S. Capitol. As founding president of the Capitol Historical Society, FRED has done much to impress upon his fellow Congressmen the history and meaning of the buildings in which we daily work. His study and application of history to the affairs of our day have not stopped there. No Member more effectively draws upon our national experience and pride to provide inspiration and chart sound directions in solving problems of today and tomorrow.

FRED SCHWENGEL was first elected to Congress in 1954. Since that time he has unceasingly worked for the betterment of his district and the country. He has been recognized by all as an effective, imaginative Congressman. His solid voting record is a credit to the people who have elected him.

DEDUCTIBLE EDUCATIONAL TRUST FUNDS COULD EASE THE BURDEN ON MIDDLE-INCOME AMERICANS FACED WITH HIGHER EDUCATION COSTS

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the cost of higher education is increasing at a staggering rate. Many parents, particularly those in middle-income levels, are finding it more and more difficult to finance the cost of educating their children.

Many families attempt to cope with the problem through savings, loans, or scholarships—or a combination of all three—but rising educational costs and tax rates may soon make it prohibitive for many parents to send their children to college at all. Financing higher education is fast becoming a major national problem.

Take, for example, a 30-year-old father with two children ages 8 and 10. By 1976 this father can look forward to having his oldest child ready for college and the second one right behind. This family can expect to lay out \$10,000 to \$20,000 within the next 10 to 16 years for tuition and expenses.

The key to this problem, of course, is advanced planning. Many parents are making the attempt to put away money for this purpose. We could help these parents, and encourage many others to do so, by providing an incentive for educational trust funds.

Almost every year dozens of bills are tossed in the hopper to lessen the burden on the middle-income family so their children can go to college.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts and several other colleagues have developed an excellent proposal which would permit parents a limited tax deduction for money set aside in an educational trust fund for their children's college education.

I strongly support the concept of the Burke bill, H.R. 12891, and I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts on his leadership in presenting this important proposal. In fact, the bill I am submitting today embraces many of the provisions of the Burke bill.

My bill would allow a taxpayer to set aside in a "higher education fund" up to \$500 for each eligible child, and provides for a deduction from gross income up to a maximum of \$2,500 a year for contributions to this fund. In other words a family, whatever its level of income, would be permitted to deduct up to \$500 per eligible dependent for up to five dependents and save this money in a custodial or trust fund earmarked for higher education expenses.

The \$500 and \$2,500 limits are reasonable and would provide tremendous incentive for those parents who elect to plan ahead for their future college expenses.

These limits should not place a unreasonable burden on the economy. In fact the benefits which would accrue to

society by extending higher education to more young people through private financing should far offset any tax revenue reduction, and would lessen the necessity for funding more and more of the Nation's higher education costs with tax dollars.

Mr. Speaker, nothing can be more important to our people and country than the education of our young. By encouraging longer range savings plans for higher education, we can help ease the burdens of the increasing costs of educating our children.

KLEIN CRACKING DOWN

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the many pleasures of being an elected official is the opportunity to meet and become acquainted with some of our Nation's outstanding citizens. It is also rewarding to know that our administration has been able to attract such individuals to serve in positions of leadership and responsibility. Such is the case of Carl L. Klein, Assistant Secretary for Water Quality and Research, U.S. Department of the Interior.

It was my pleasure to serve in the Illinois State Legislature with Carl Klein where he was instrumental in the legislative effort to formulate water quality standards for the State of Illinois. He is familiar with the problems that face us in this most important effort and has the ability to overcome the many obstacles that now exist and stand in the way of improving the quality of this great national resource.

The task will not be an easy one to achieve, and I was pleased to read that he has taken a strong position to advance our national commitment to improve the quality of our water. For this reason, I would like to call the following article to the attention of the House:

[From the Illinois Federation of Sportsmen's "Wildlife," July 23, 1969]

KLEIN CRACKING DOWN

"President Nixon has assigned a top priority to environmental quality with heavy emphasis on cleaning up water pollution," according to Carl L. Klein, Assistant Secretary for Water Quality and Research, Department of the Interior.

"This is one of only three such Cabinet Councils that President Nixon has established. In the Executive Order establishing it, Section 103 places heavy responsibility for the success of this Council on the Secretary of the Interior. This shows that we mean business and that we plan to get the job done, according to the President's instructions 'to protect against pollution of the Nation's air, water and land, and its living resources'."

"Secretary Hickel has given us definite instructions to use all possible and attainable means to improve the pollution situation," Mr. Klein stated. "This is not just a 'tough' policy for the sake of being tough; it is a reasonable approach to the countless problems. We intend to follow Secretary Hickel's policy vigorously. Where necessary, we will

use every method of reaching attainable goals as the Secretary has instructed us."

Secretary Klein believes that major improvements in pollution abatement can be accomplished by informal confrontations in addition to enforcement conferences, since everybody concerned knows that these have the force of law lurking in the background. These negotiations have already begun to produce results as pointed out in a letter of May 21, 1969, from Mr. Klein to The New York Times:

"A statement of anti-pollution policy from United States Steel Company several weeks ago culminated long negotiations, and will undoubtedly be a help in the fight for industrial waste pollution abatement; the state of Missouri has agreed to hold its own conferences to update the 1982 date accepted by my predecessor for secondary treatment on the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers and has scheduled the first hearing for June 13; discussions on the Memphis situation with local authorities resulted in plans for early construction of a primary sewage treatment plant; informal talks with St. Charles, Missouri have led to implementation for both primary and secondary treatment plants where the issue was stalled before."

This confrontation process by no means precludes any renunciation of the legal recourse. Interior has conducted, or planned, five conferences since Klein took office on March 20, 1969. These were at Washington, D.C., Boston, Massachusetts, Duluth, Minnesota, New York, N.Y., with another scheduled for June 27 at Cleveland, Ohio. Klein has plans for several other such conferences of the previous administrations; it is, in fact, a stepping up of enforcement conferences.

Upon completion of the conference, the Secretary is also required to make recommendations for remedial action if such recommendations are indicated. "The Secretary is not without power when abatement does not take place on interstate waters," Mr. Klein points out. "Under the law he can call a public hearing if reasonable progress to abate pollution is not being taken. Then, if necessary, he can turn the matter over to the Attorney General for court action."

"Please rest assured," Klein has stated, "that the Secretary intends to enforce the law and take such recourse as necessary."

In connection with the Duluth hearings on Lake Superior, considerable confusion developed because of a report prepared by Dr. Charles Stoddard and submitted to the Army Engineers on his own responsibility as Regional Coordinator for the Department, a post he has since resigned. This report was disowned by former Assistant Secretary Max N. Edwards on January 17, 1969. The so-called Stoddard report also was denounced by J. I. Bregman, Deputy Assistant Secretary under the previous administration, in January as "raw, unevaluated draft, full of mistakes." Subsequently an official report from Interior was prepared for the Duluth conference.

All of these actions show that the Secretary and Mr. Klein really "mean business."

MARYLAND GI DIES IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, S. Sgt. George E. Snyder, a fine man from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend his courage and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

HAGERSTOWN GI DIES IN VIETNAM—S. SGT. GEORGE E. SNYDER KILLED IN COPTER CRASH
Staff Sgt. George E. Snyder, 29, of Hagerstown, was killed in Vietnam August 12 when the helicopter in which he was a crew member crashed while under enemy fire.

Sergeant Snyder, a seven-year Army veteran, was serving his second tour of duty in Vietnam and was due to return to the United States at the end of this month. He had previously served a year in Vietnam in 1968.

RAISED IN MICHIGAN

He was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 30th Artillery, 1st Cavalry Division. The Defense Department did not disclose the location of the action.

Sergeant Snyder was born July 12, 1940, in Clear Spring Village, Md., and moved to Ferndale, Mich., as a boy. He was raised in Michigan by an aunt, Mrs. Carrie Greathouse, and graduated from Ferndale High School in 1959.

After graduation, he worked as a meatcutter, then joined the Army and decided to make it a career.

His previous assignments included three years in Germany.

Sergeant Snyder is survived by his father, Charles J. Snyder, of Buckeystown; two brothers, Harry M. Snyder, of Hagerstown, and Jackie W. Snyder, of Buckeystown; and his aunt, Mrs. Greathouse, of Hagerstown.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, last year Congress authorized the creation of the Redwoods National Park, Biscayne Bay National Monument and the North Cascades National Park. In addition, we approved a new system of wild and scenic rivers and a national trails system. All of this was done only after the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act was amended to increase the annual revenues to the fund to \$200 million per year. We have moved forward on a sound, constructive recreation program with the understanding that \$1 billion of earmarked funds would be available in the 5-year period starting in fiscal year 1969. Our action reflects the congressional expectation that the full amount of money available in the fund would be requested by the President in his budget and utilized to make the recreation program we authorized a reality.

We understood, last year, that if these moneys were available in the next 5 years then the recreation projects already authorized could be paid for and that other areas worthy of national recognition could be considered. But we knew that the full \$200 million per year would have to be appropriated. We knew that economy demanded rapid acquisition of authorized recreation facilities if escalating land prices were to be avoided.

This year, however, the Bureau of the Budget has approved only \$124 million of the \$200 million in the land and water conservation fund and has indicated in a recent letter to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that no larger amount will be approved for the year 1971. This means that it will

take 7 or 8 years to pay for the recreation areas already authorized even if land prices in the areas remain at current levels and that is a circumstance which no reasonable person can predict.

Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of the Budget has not kept faith with the Congress. Its obligation is to carry out the mandates, considered by Congress and approved by the President. It is no super Congress, though its overbearing omnipresence suggests it would take over the constitutional powers of Congress if it could.

I do not see how the administration can combat inflation by refusing to keep commitments to purchase land with money already placed in an earmarked fund.

During the recess period last August, I, as chairman of the House Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation, along with other subcommittee members visited the proposed Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in the State of Michigan. We also visited, and conducted hearings concerning two other proposed areas—the proposed Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in Wisconsin and the proposed Voyageurs National Park in Minnesota. These are all beautiful, unspoiled areas of park-like quality. They represent an opportunity which, at least, merits consideration by the Congress. Witnesses for and against the proposals emphasized that action should be taken to resolve the issue one way or the other. The people owning the land want to know how to plan their future. It is unfair to keep them dangling, but it would be grossly inequitable for Congress to authorize additional park and recreation areas if adequate funds are not going to be requested to make reasonable progress toward making them available for public use.

Mr. Speaker, we feel that in recent years the Congress has established a sound recreation program for our Nation. In establishing the land and water conservation fund, we made our intent clear. It is in the nature of a trust fund for the future of all Americans. From it moneys were to be appropriated to accomplish objectives which we—the Congress—established. Now the Bureau of the Budget, with its petty approach to this program, is making it impossible for us to live up to commitments made and to maintain reasonable progress on an orderly program for the future. While the Bureau of the Budget has created this intolerable situation, the Congress is being unjustly blamed for it.

CONGRESSMAN FRED SCHWENGEL

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 24, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that my respected colleague, Mr. MORSE, has taken a special order which affords me the opportunity to pay tribute to a close friend and equally respected colleague of mine, FRED SCHWENGEL.

Ever since entering Congress I have marveled at the diversity and acumen of this fine gentleman. Few other men exemplify the ability to champion sensitive yet vital issues without permanently alienating those who do not agree with them. FRED SCHWENGEL has championed much far-reaching legislation and has never failed to maintain the respect of all Congressmen who have had the chance to know him either on the House floor or outside the Chambers of congressional activity.

As president of the Capitol Historical Society, he has insured that traditions and majesty bestowed on us by our forefathers will continue to be enjoyed by our generation and the generations to come.

Representative SCHWENGEL, a man of integrity and both active and effective as a legislator is completing his 12th year in Congress. I think that today's special order is an opportune moment not only to thank him for maintaining the highest congressional standards but for also giving all of us the chance to know a warm, capable, and intelligent colleague.

PTA NATIONAL CHOOSES PRICE PRESIDENT

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, everyone in Texas is proud to see the PTA choose Mrs. Pearl Price as their national president. This lovely lady has done more than any one person in the Southwest to build more effective leadership for progressive education.

Her energy is unlimited. Her personality is effervescent. Her sincerity and friendship is as broad as her wide range of activity.

I believe the sound judgment and council of Pearl Price will establish this year as a record period of achievement for the PTA.

All of you will be interested in this fine article written September 24, 1969, by Doris E. Harris, managing editor of the Oak Cliff Tribune about our fine neighbor:

She's so small that she only chins the podium, but when she speaks, America's parents, educators and politicians listen.

Pearl Price is the first lady of the national Parent Teachers Association. Thanks to people like her, PTA no longer stands for Pretty-Tired-Attitudes. Today, it's where the action is, and Mrs. Price is very much a part of its fresh mobility.

When the Oak Cliff homemaker, mother and grandmother, makes a point, it frequently works its way to President Nixon's ears, thence into the hands of some of his most important aides.

"We CAN turn our world around," proclaimed Mrs. Price at her inauguration last May. "It's high time we put on our own demonstration; time we acted in accord with the morality and democratic values that we profess. We must give our believes in humane values in a daily workout."

Pearl's ideas will get plenty of exercise this December, when the President's White

House Conference on Food, Health and Nutrition convenes in Washington, D.C. under the direction of Dr. Jean Mayer.

Mayer, author of "Hunger, USA," has been appointed by President Nixon to head a research and report team on such issues as providing proper nutrition in school lunches, assuring the consumer full value for his food purchases, and the possibility of using food stamps to combat hunger.

By December, however, the White House Conference will already have become well acquainted with Pearl Price. For she fills a key role in research and development of the program. In fact, she flew to Chicago only this week to confer with Mayer, his committee and the PTA national board, about the December session. The White House conference findings will have major influence upon legislation, and thus upon the very course of tomorrow's society.

"The PTA's job," says Mrs. Price, "is to create awareness among the people. No problem can be solved unless it is first recognized."

Mrs. Price attributes her own awareness of the human predicament in today's world to the PTA. "If I hadn't become involved with this group when my children were young, I might never have had the opportunity or incentive to keep up with what's going on," she admits.

Pearl and her husband, Leon S. Price, a retired employee of Texas & Pacific Railway, are parents of two grown daughters, Mrs. Lee G. (Patti) Gunter of Corpus Christi, and Mrs. Jack D. (Laura) Mahoney of South America. The Prices also have two grandchildren in the Gunter family.

Mrs. Price launched her PTA career here in Oak Cliff, when Laura was enrolled in W. E. Greiner Junior High School. She served there as president and later headed the Dallas City Council of PTA. She was eventually offered the state presidency, several seats on the national board, and finally, the national office.

She is also active in the Dallas Council on World Affairs, Zonta Club, Greater Dallas Planning Council and Cliff Temple Baptist Church.

Mrs. Price's national job has demanded that she become a frequent traveler, an aspect which she enjoys. But her favorite hours are those which she and her husband share on their long evening walks along the creek bank near their home at 406 Mayrant.

"My husband is my most loyal supporter, and my most ardent critic," says Mrs. Price.

"She has the constitution of a mule," her husband affectionately taunts.

Asked how it feels to be a national figure, Mrs. Price replied: "Well, I don't know. I've never thought about it. One thing is sure, I'm glad to be a woman. We have a lot of responsibility, but we also have many privileges and opportunities which belong exclusively to our sex."

Aside from the professional goals which she must try to achieve, there is a personal aspiration too. When her two-year term ends in 1971, she hopes she will have been "good for our children and our youth."

Already, Pearl Price has demonstrated her ability to move mountains (and people); to be nimble when it comes to leaping across the generation gap; and to promote better understanding among different races, creeds and eras.

son celebrated his 61st birthday—his first birthday in a number of years that was not celebrated while he was in the service of his Government.

Each day, President Johnson's record looks better and better. In his role as elder statesman, even at this young age, he has gained added stature and respect by quietly going about his business and not trying to second guess the national leaders on domestic programs. His advice is sought by leaders of both parties—and the President gives frank and penetrating suggestions that come from nearly 40 years of experiences on the Washington scene.

Conrad Black, publisher of the Record in Sherbrooke, Canada, has written a fitting tribute to President Johnson and his service to the Nation.

I commend this article—written by a Canadian who can understand President Johnson's contributions in an objective manner—I commend the article for all Americans to read:

A YEAR AFTER CHICAGO: HOMAGE TO L.B.J.

(By Conrad Black)

(NOTE.—Conrad Black is the publisher of the Sherbrooke, Canada, Record. He was formerly associated with the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group which he represented at the Convention of the US Democratic Party in 1964.)

Lyndon Baines Johnson left Washington seven months ago, after more than three decades there, and home again under "the tattered skies of Texas" he reflects on a uniquely long and productive career.

As secretary to a Congressman he arrived in Washington in the vanguard of the New Deal in 1932, and after two years in the National Youth Administration, was elected to Congress in 1937, aged 29.

Throughout his public career, Johnson advocated liberal domestic policies, military preparedness, and full international participation. He led the fight which resulted in irrigation, flood and drought control, and rural electrification for almost one sixth of all Texas; supported aid to embattled Britain and peacetime conscription in 1940 and 1941, and large post-war foreign aid programs, starting with the Marshall Plan.

Despite his reputation as a liberal and international maverick, Johnson was elected Senator in 1948, following a hotly contested primary which he won by 87 votes out of 988,000 cast. This precarious result was upheld in subsequent investigations, and Johnson took his place in the Senate as one of the few southerners who had remained loyal to the administration after the accession of Harry Truman.

It is generally agreed that Lyndon Johnson was one of the most effective, ingenious, and picturesque figures in the whole storied history of the United States Senate. He became the youngest Majority Leader in history in 1955, and except during elections, was the most powerful member of the Democratic Party throughout the Eisenhower years. These were lean times for American liberals and Johnson was the nation's principal source of progressive legislation. He exposed huge wastes in defense procurement during the Korean War; engineered the downfall of the immensely distasteful Senator Joseph R. McCarthy and the dissolution of his witch-hunting committee in 1954; and secured passage of civil rights bills in 1957 and 1960, the first initiatives taken by Congress in this field in 80 years. In his successful espousal of the latter act he had to put down a fullscale filibuster by southern Democrats. One of the leading opponents, then as subsequently, was William Fulbright of Arkansas, who recently has demanded for the people of South Vietnam liberties whose

extension to the U.S. negro he has stertorously denounced as unconstitutional.

Johnson's judgment of the mood of the Senate was unerring, and he became a ubiquitous, mysterious, potentate, always in motion, surrounded by scurrying aides and bourbon-bibbing cronies in a gothic tableau already very much of another era.

Johnson was an early advocate of missile development and space exploration; was the first chairman of the Aeronautics and Space Committee set up after the original fiascos of the American space program, and continued to have responsibility for this program under President Kennedy. He has always defended it against budgetary critics, and has overseen its growth from a retarded and embarrassing infancy to the recent outstanding successes of the Apollo series.

THE NEW FRONTIER

In 1958 Johnson brought forth a comprehensive program of reform that was the manifesto for his party's sweeping Congressional victory that year. It was a plan "to extend the American frontier," the inspiration for the slogan "New Frontier" that Kennedy made famous in 1960. Johnson came second to Kennedy in the quest for the Democratic Presidential nomination in 1960, and surprised many by accepting second spot on the ticket. Kennedy's assistant, Theodore Sorensen, has written that Kennedy regarded Johnson as: "A Senator's Senator who had accomplished more in Congress in the previous eight years than Eisenhower. Kennedy admired from first hand observation Johnson's tireless ability to campaign, cajole, and persuade, his leadership of the party in its dark days, and his sure-footed finesse in the Senate. Refusing to back down on civil rights, Johnson brought persuasive pressure to bear on southern Senators, Governors, and local leaders who had theretofore refused to work for a politically unpopular ticket." In one of the closest elections in U.S. history, Johnson provided the margin of victory in the south, and was the only person who could have done so. Probably, neither Kennedy nor Johnson would have become President without the other.

As Vice President, Johnson concentrated on the space program, foreign visits, especially to Berlin and the Far East, and the Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, where he continued to work for racial understanding.

NOVEMBER 22, 1963

Never has a President been sworn in who was better qualified by experience, and never in more tragic circumstances than Lyndon B. Johnson, hastily inaugurated at Dallas Airport on November 22, 1963, following the assassination of his popular and talented predecessor.

The contrast between the styles of the old and new Presidents was sharp and continued to grate on many who fondly remembered the facile elegance of Kennedy and his principal collaborators. Though the transition was carried out with dignity, the initial spirit of national unity created around the new leader gave way to a feeling among many that Johnson was an illegitimate President, and even a usurper.

Kennedy had achieved passage of only 39 per cent of the bills he had sent to Congress. This shockingly low figure attests to the amateurishness of his approach to Congress and to the lethargic performance of Mike Mansfield, Johnson's bland and ineffectual successor as Majority Leader. Johnson's view had been that the Congress should be as productive as possible, regardless of the party standings, and he helped secure passage of 46 per cent of the Eisenhower program. As President, Johnson gained adoption of a phenomenal 66 per cent of his proposals, and when he entered the White House, committee chairmen accustomed to whimsically

PRESIDENT JOHNSON IS HONORED

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, last month, our former President Lyndon B. John-

delaying Presidential priorities indefinitely soon learned that there was a new hand on the realm.

Johnson rescued from committees where they had languished for many months Kennedy's civil rights and tax-cut bills, and cleared them through Congress. Similarly, Kennedy's agriculture bill which had been continually rejected by Congress, and finally by farmers themselves in a referendum, was passed with minor alterations for Johnson's signature.

THE GREAT SOCIETY

President Johnson unveiled his Great Society program before 80,000 people at Ann Arbor, Michigan, in May, 1964. A plan for massive social and political change, it was the platform from which L. B. J. led his party to the greatest electoral victory in American history that autumn. The opposition was Senator Barry Goldwater, and his following of antediluvian conservatives, who had sent millions of American moderates to the walling wall with their call for the dismantling of most of the gains made by American liberals since Roosevelt's day. It is hard to believe now, but in that year many felt that liberalism was endangered by the long-stifed forces of reaction, which had captured the Republican Party. Perhaps the most damaging issue for Goldwater in that campaign was that, since he had suggested nuclear defoliation of the jungles of Vietnam, he might be tempted, in General Lemay's inimitable phrase, "to lob one into the men's room in the Kremlin".

As the American involvement in Vietnam grew so did the illusion that Johnson had pledged himself in that campaign to avoid escalation of the Vietnam War. He pledged nothing of the kind. He pledged to respond with appropriate measures to the actions of the enemy; he pledged to seek co-operation with the communist powers, especially the Soviet Union, and he commended himself to the U.S. voters as more moderate in word and therefore in deed also, than his opponent. History will record that he kept his pledge.

Johnson used the immense harvest of votes in 1964 to press his domestic program. The Great Society legislation was one of the finest, if least fully appreciated, hours in the fretful history of American liberalism. The last five years are rivalled as a period of legislative productivity only by the first four years of the New Deal, and when current emotionalism subsidizes LBJ will take his place beside FDR in the pantheon of American reformers.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Those who had despaired of the cause of justice to the negro when a southerner became President; who flourished alleged quotations from a Johnson 20 years younger campaigning for election in rural Texas, were silenced by the President's words to the Congress and the nation, March 15, 1965. Speaking of the negroes then demonstrating in and around Selma, Alabama, he said: "Their cause must be our cause too. Because it is not just negroes, but really it is all of us, who must overcome." Martin Luther King commented that the speech was "one of the most eloquent, unequivocal, and passionate pleas for human rights ever made by a President of the United States. He revealed great and amazing understanding of the depth and dimension of the problem of racial injustice".

The voting rights bill that the President then sent to Congress, which approved it, was the most significant forward step for American blacks since the Proclamation of Emancipation. Johnson was the first President since Abraham Lincoln to do something to improve the lives of all blacks, and through two civil rights acts and numerous economic and social laws, he did a great deal.

The initial steps toward the Great Society were leftovers from the Kennedy program;

the War on Poverty and the Appalachia relief and road-construction bill, but the program broadened into a concentrated attack on all the roots of dispossession and underprivilege in America. Poverty was combatted through stimulation of small businesses, advanced and improved education for the children of poor families, creation of a National Teacher Corps, job retraining for the unemployed of all ages, aid through incentives to depressed areas, and community development programs, some of them managed by the most novel forms of local administration.

SOCIAL PROGRESS

The War on Poverty was much criticized for overlapping, bureaucratic inefficiencies, and the supposedly Orwellian implications of expanding big government. The President himself admitted there was waste and agreed that streamlining was in order. Despite difficulties, most of the program will be retained by the new administration and the number of Americans hobbled by conditions of poverty according to an inflation-adjusted scale declined from 1963 to 1968 by more than six million.

When Johnson first attained elected office, President Roosevelt spoke of "one third of a nation" in the structures of poverty; as he left, after thirty years of work on their behalf, the fraction was one seventh.

Johnson did more for the expansion and availability of medical facilities than any previous President, passing several far-reaching but not coercive measures. Most important was the Medicare bill, a left-over from the Truman days, and supposedly the principal policy difference between Kennedy and Nixon in 1960. It was passed under Johnson's artful prodding after twice being rejected during the Kennedy administration.

Unquestionably, Lyndon Johnson has done more for the development of American education than any other individual in the history of the nation. The much admired former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, John Gardner described a conversation about education with the ex-President as "one of the most exciting moments of my life." According to the New York Times: "Education has been the interest closest to the President's heart, and a national leader could have no more important concern. He has signed into law more than forty separate pieces of legislation to support education, from pre-school projects to graduate education. The federal government has nearly tripled its investment in education, and has for the first time, brought federal money directly to the slum schools which need it most."

Lyndon Johnson was the first President to seriously tackle the whole complex of urban problems that had been allowed to fester virtually untended for the entire history of industrial America up to his intervention.

Housing: from a plodding and grossly underfunded throwaway building about 30,000 units a year for low-income families in the Kennedy era, he expanded the federal program to the projected construction of 300,000 units this year, and over six million in the next ten years. Besides new construction, the President's program, one of the most imaginative and extensive ever devised anywhere, emphasizes home improvement in shabby but not irreparable areas, rent supplements for hundreds of thousands of families and the enlistment for the first time of private industry, through tax incentives, in the construction of housing.

Government departments of Housing and Urban Development, and of Transportation, were set up to concentrate the federal approach to these problems, and a Model Cities Act was passed whereby Washington has already subsidized more than 150 locally devised schemes for the improvement of the local urban environment. Mindful of the problems created by entrusting too much of

the War on Poverty to the federal bureaucracy, Johnson here, as with housing involved private industry and local authorities as builders and planners, while the federal government served as a catalyst and financing guarantor.

Lyndon Johnson, the Texas rancher, in the mastering of the corrosive problem of environmental pollution and in the conservation of wildlife and natural resources, has made a contribution unique in his country's history. He has added millions of acres to the domain of national parks, secured passage of multi-billion dollar schemes for the cleaning up of the Great Lakes, for the disposal of solid wastes, the beautification of rivers and highways and federal property, the depollution of the air and shores of America, and the creation of greater recreational facilities for its people.

The Johnson program could also be cited for many other advances such as the dissemination of birth control information (the first administration to legislate on this controversial subject), and consumer protection through an assortment of bills including landmark measures for truth in packaging, and money-lending auto safety standards, and cigarette-smoking health warnings. The Safe Streets and Crime Control Act has made law enforcement more efficient without reducing individual collective liberties. There were also bills for the financing of Presidential campaigns and control and licensing of firearms, which although more modest than the Administration requested, were at least a beginning.

The Congressional Quarterly reports that in the five years of the Johnson Presidency, five times as much important legislation was passed than in the previous 10 years under Eisenhower and Kennedy. Lyndon Johnson also sought, without great success, to be one of the few Presidents to change the structure of American political life through the almost impossible procedure of constitutional amendment. Under his Administration, there was an amendment providing that the Vice Presidency should never be left vacant, as it was for 14 months after the death of President Kennedy. Some of his other principal proposals, though not yet acted upon, may be considered of a prophetic nature: lowering the voting age to 18; lengthening the term of the House of Representatives to four years; and abolition of the electoral college to eliminate the possibility of a hung election, such as almost occurred in the 1968 Nixon-Humphrey-Wallace race.

It is the primordial cliché on the subject of Johnson to say that the ghetto riots and the Vietnam war did him in. Most Negro militant leaders, excepting Eldridge Cleaver, Bobby Seale and other members of the criminal lunatic fringe, are in accord that the era of the big riots is over, and there have been no significant riots since shortly after the death of Martin Luther King in April, 1968. The exodus from the southern cotton fields to the northern ghettos is now almost at an end, and the population of some ghettos is already declining.

The United States is now enjoying high employment and has committed itself to equalizing standards of education, hireability, housing, and sanitation, between the black and white communities, among lower economic groups and for the first time, most Negroes are now in the middle class. There is some reason to believe, therefore, as newscaster Chet Huntley remarked, that the riots of recent years, "were not signal-fires of the future, but funeral pyres of the past." It is difficult to see, in any event, how this painful period of adjustment could have been avoided and what more Johnson could have done for racial justice.

VIETNAM

Vietnam is a story too well known to require telling, yet too agonized and uncertain

to be dealt with briefly. However, several points are worth recording already. President Johnson inherited a deteriorating situation from his predecessor and was advised by all those whose advice he also inherited (Bundy, Rusk, Taylor, McNamara, et al.), to intervene forcefully. Indeed, as even dovish columnist Stewart Alsop remarked, it was surprising that Kennedy's attempt to win the war "by proxy" took as long as it did to fail. Throughout the time of active American involvement in Vietnam, Johnson has stated that his country's motives were not total victory, but honorable compromise: his speech at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, in June, 1965, was one of the more memorable of such restatements and to this end, he called three bombing halts prior to 1968. The principal motives of the American involvement in Vietnam were:

To prove that the murderous euphemism of "the people's war of liberation" is not an invincible means of territorial expansion; to aid in the construction of a balance of power in East Asia by developing a coalition of states as a counterweight to China; to contain and deter the eruptive and aggressive force of revolutionary China-Vietnam; to prevent one of Asia's most strategic areas (before the war South Vietnam was the greatest rice exporter in Asia) from falling by default into the hands of America's self-proclaimed enemies; and to honor the original SEATO commitments signed by President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Churchill in 1954.

In these objectives, the U.S.A. has been supported by all the noncommunist states of the area, except Cambodia. The recent stirring of the Philippines and Japan from slumber under the American umbrella, and the downfall of the pyrotechnic President Sukarno in Indonesia, augur well for the American goal of an independent and self-reliant coalition of noncommunist states in the Far East. The other objectives will be achieved if the peace that seems slowly to be emerging from the tortuous roundel at Paris is the honorable compromise President Johnson long ago pledged himself to pursue.

Except for the hysterical and apocalyptic, to whose venomous and uninformed tongues the tedious refrain of genocide, war criminals, etc. comes automatically the principal objection to the Vietnamese policy has been on the grounds that the energies expended in the war could never be justified or repaid, even by the war's victorious conclusion.

This is a serious argument that may never be resolved, and certainly not before the war is ended and its cost can be estimated. At no time did the war absorb more than 15 per cent of federal government expenditures. The loss of 34,000 men over 7 years is of course an immeasurable tragedy, even in a country which loses over 60,000 dead a year on its highways. However, the cost of abandoning Vietnam and with it the objectives enumerated above would also have been very heavy. Perhaps President Johnson was being somewhat theatrical when he said: "Not even blood is a high price to pay for civilization" but before dismissing the war as a sanguinary fiasco, critics should assess the grievous implications of the uniformly unpleasant alternatives, an exercise that few critics have troubled to attempt.

The war was never a holy crusade against communism and those who accuse the ex-President of having an irrational fear of the "international communist conspiracy" (words which neither he nor any other administration spokesman has uttered since the Dulles era), ignore the fact that he negotiated the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty, a trade expansion, and encouragement plan, a consular agreement, and the beginnings of general armaments-control talks with the Soviet Union. All of these were stalled or rejected by the Senate, or had to be postponed be-

cause of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. Johnson also assembled a staff of China experts who were designated to occupy the U.S. Embassy in Peking when conditions eventually permit mutual recognition between the two countries.

ABDICATION

When Lyndon Johnson announced on March 21, 1968, that he would not seek reelection, it was the greatest bombshell in an American political generation. Senator Eugene McCarthy had come close to defeating the President in the New Hampshire Primary, but he was certainly not a serious threat to his authority. McCarthy's urbane but supercilious waspishness finally irritated as many people as it impressed and his recent erratic conduct had caused many to wonder if he is even fit to continue as a mediocre, lazy and temperamental Senator let alone preside over the nation. His campaign was based on three factors: peace at almost any price in Vietnam; a scatter-gun demand for reduction of the powers of the Presidency, a vague and rather maudlin recollection of the tranquil, midwest, mid-twenties, America of Sinclair Lewis (the bandshell-in-the-park syndrome); a flimsy platform indeed. Furthermore, McCarthy seems to be a political masochist: his hero is Sir Thomas More and it is difficult to shed the impression that he, too, wanted to be beheaded by Henry VIII—LBJ.

But McCarthy's performance did smoke out the real opposition: Bobby Kennedy was moved to make yet another "reassessment" of his "noncandidacy." He would enter the lists, to save the very liberalism Johnson had fought for 30 years to advance and to deliver the nation from Richard Nixon.

Johnson never doubted who Judas would be. In the last two years of his regime, Johnson was obliged to deal with a steadily increasing barrage of hysterical and infantile abuse from reflex liberals in Congress, the Democratic Party, and the press. Bobby Kennedy, as the inimitable opportunist of contemporary American affairs, bubbled naturally to the top of this political cesspool—the war-time President's traditional cup of hemlock.

Even Stewart Alsop, one of the more torrential snivellers of the American press, recently wrote that "a lot of people, especially journalistic admirers of President Kennedy, including this one, have been brutally unfair to Lyndon Johnson." Many of the same writers who decried the Congress in Kennedy's day as cumbrous and obsolescent insinuated that Johnson was an immoderate and power-lusting autocrat when he made the system work. Many of the dispossessed Kennedys who criticized Johnson for pirating the unhatched brain-children of his "martyred" predecessor, blasted him in equal voice for unimaginative and antiquated solutions to the problems of the '60's; and asinine criticism in itself, but doubly so considering the source. The same elements which denounced Johnson for appointing a commission to investigate the cause of riots because it would bring forth hum-drum recommendations, paused only to draw breath before attacking him for not requesting immediate Congressional action on the commission's very penetrating and even radical report.

The President had recently suffered the defeat of an open housing-civil rights bill, and of a bill giving home rule to Washington, D.C., a predominately Negro city, though his manner of getting around this and appointing a Negro mayor in spite of Congress, prompted liberal writer Richard Rovere to reaffirm that Johnson was a great President in all respects except Vietnam. The Riots Commission reported that "white racism" was the principal cause of Negro violence, and true though this perhaps was, the President was understandably reluctant to send

to Congress a controversial measure that would have no chance of success. Many of the critics who accused Johnson of being too intractable with the Communist powers cried like stuck pigs when it occurred to them that he might meet with the Soviet leadership even after the invasion of Czechoslovakia.

Arthur Schlesinger, by his interminable whining support of lost causes and his attempts to become a swinger through the doubtful baptism of repeated dunkings in Ethel Kennedy's swimming pool is now one of America's more pathetic figures. He lightly criticized Kennedy for Vietnam ("He never gave it his full attention, it was the greatest failing of his administration."), but condemned Johnson for being "obsessed" with the subject.

Time Magazine, which three years before when it was beating the drums for Vietnam, had declared that General William Westmoreland was the "Man of the Year", had the affrontery to accuse Johnson of praising the General too highly when he promoted him from the Vietnam command to be Army Chief of Staff.

Last and certainly least, Norman Mailer, the bedraggled warhorse of American blowhardism, whose effort to become the moral arbiter of modern America was hindered somewhat by his stabbing of his first wife, and who by his own admission is "full of crap", was taken seriously for the first time in 20 years when he uttered the most specious and irrelevant opinions about Johnson.

Some merely misunderstood Johnson; many others subjected him to the most disgusting abuse. Stokely Carmichael called him a "hunky, a buffoon, and a liar", and H. Rap Brown suggested that Johnson and his wife "should be shot". Robert Sherrill described Johnson as "treacherous, dishonest, manic-aggressive, spoiled", and he was referred to in the play MacBird, as a "canker, tyrant, villain, traitor, cur." The campaign of youthful vilification against the President reached a sickening climax in Chicago last August. The president was in Texas celebrating his birthday, but this did not prevent thousands of youths from marching around Grant Park shouting the ultimate obscenity at Johnson, and finally feeding a birthday cake to a pig in commemoration of his anniversary. Johnson said only that if he were a young person he would probably feel like protesting too; a less patient and dedicated man, when taunted incessantly with the chant "Hey, hey, L. B. J., how many kids have you killed today?" might have been tempted to reply: "none, unfortunately."

BOBBY

The aspiring head of all the opposition, responsible and not, was Bobby Kennedy, who regarded Johnson as a crude interloper, tainted by long years of public service in previous eras less enlightened and edifying than the Kennedy camelot. As the senior surviving Kennedy brother, he felt that he had not only the right, but the obligation to keep faith with the honoured dead by ending this usurpation. His statement the previous July that Johnson was "a great President", like his long-standing enthusiasm for the Vietnam War before public support for it fell off, he dismissed with a glazed pall of boyish prevarication and the fatuous remark that the "only sin is to be too proud to admit mistakes." One of Kennedy's principal coconspirators was Jesse Unruh, the corpulent boss of California Democrats. The mere gross appearance of this man indicates that he has had his front feet in the trough long enough. This impression is fortified by the bovine imagery which characterizes Unruh's speech; (i.e. "Money is the mother-milk of politics.")

Johnson looked on Bobby as the man who had worked for Joseph McCarthy, American liberalism's greatest enemy, whom Johnson

overthrew; as the man who had objected to Johnson's nomination as Vice President in 1960 but was overruled by his brother who fortunately for the Democrats had a better knowledge of political arithmetic: as the man who as Attorney General had been the foremost wire-tapper in U.S. history; who had been caught publicly lying by the F.B.I., who had suddenly discovered a hatful of votes in civil rights after Johnson had worked for racial understanding for years in the unfertile south; as the man who in running for his first elective office, as Senator from New York, had gotten into trouble on the carpet-bagger issue, requested the aid of the President's coat-tails and trailed Johnson into office by two million votes, and as the man who spoke as if he had discovered the word meritocracy, yet had inherited access to more money and popularity than any politician in U.S. history.

There wasn't room for both of them in Washington, and shortly both were gone. If they had contested at the convention in Chicago, Johnson would surely have won. At the time he withdrew, all surveys showed him with an easy and assured majority of the delegates, most of them unshakable Johnson loyalists, friends accumulated over a long career of influential backscratching. In view of the close race run by his stand-in, Hubert Humphrey, he might even have won re-election. His withdrawal was motivated in part by health reasons, and in part by a fear of electoral defeat, which would have been a humiliating last hurrah. But even the jaded Washington press corps managed to find more important reasons. The serried ranks of American punditry wavered badly in the Johnson years; the cavernously pontifical Walter Lippmann changed course so often, but always with such oracular pomposity, that one was tempted to ask if the real Walter Lippmann would please shut up; and the remarks of the eternally smug and smart Tom Wicker were rarely deserving of attention. But Stewart Alsop, conscience-ridden as usual, raised himself above his peers long enough to give this assessment of Johnson's withdrawal: "Lyndon Johnson could almost certainly have bullied his way through to renomination, and quite possibly to re-election. To abandon power goes against the man's every instinct; yet he chose to do so. He so chose for several reasons, some not unconnected with his colossal pride. But the main reason, surely, was simply love of country. He knew the country would have to pay a terrible price in what he called, in his March 31 speech, 'divisiveness', if he ran again. He chose not to make the country pay that price. For that, as well as for much else for which he has received little credit, Lyndon Johnson deserves the heartfelt thanks of his countrymen."

HISTORY'S JUDGMENT

The Chicago Sun-Times said that the nation had failed him more often than he had failed the nation; more likely, neither had failed. As Johnson left office, racial tensions were declining somewhat; Vietnam was going better militarily, and peace seemed in sight; there were two consecutive balanced budgets; the official balance of payments was favourable again after ten years of chronic deficits; and employment was almost full. Inflation was admittedly a serious problem but the tools to combat it were at hand. The New York Times said: "Mr. Johnson has presided over a new age of progressivism. He laboured mightily on behalf of this nation and always tried to serve the best interest of all the people. He has no reason to fear history's judgment."

Indeed many serious historians such as Allan Nevins, Clinton Rossiter and James MacGregor Burns already regard him as an outstanding President.

The reforms achieved by Johnson differed from Roosevelt's in that they were aimed

more at economic rehabilitation than emergency relief, and in contrast to the depression President, he attacked poverty and underprivilege without baiting the rich. His objective was not a redistribution of the wealth of the country, a Robin Hood-like taking from the rich to give to the poor. The rationale for the Great Society was that the natural premium on the growth of the American economy could be used to raise up the disadvantaged to the level of economic participation. The poor could be helped without hurting the rich, said L.B.J., and the same President who cut the maximum personal income tax rate by 26 per cent also raised welfare and services expenditures from 30 to 68 billion dollars. The same President Johnson who was derided by liberals as an heirloom from the New Deal, first sponsored the involvement of business in the reconstruction of society through a program of grants and incentives. The first southern President in over a century to a certain extent he reintegrated the south in political processes of the country. The President who routed the extreme right in 1964, he also helped to save the country from the extreme left in 1968.

His one really serious mistake was to send 540,000 soldiers to a foreign war without express Congressional authorization. He could have obtained such approval, in February, 1965, almost unanimously, and a man of Johnson's experience should have known better than to embark on that enterprise on such vague authority as the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, which only urged him to take the steps necessary for the defense of American interests.

If there was a second mistake, it was his handling of the Detroit riot in 1967, when he insisted that Michigan Governor Romney admit that he had lost control of the situation before the dispatch of federal troops. This gave the impression of playing politics with lives in one of the nation's largest cities.

Some critics claim the Dominican Republic intervention in 1965 was a mistake, but the operation was quite successful. A communist take-over through front organizations was avoided, and in impartially supervised free elections, the anticommunist candidate won a landslide victory. Johnson could however, have been rather more convincing in explaining the motive for the O.A.S. intervention.

More damaging than any blunder; Johnson was not, as his old mentor Franklin D. Roosevelt had said the President must be: "preeminently the head of the American people for the Presidency is a place of moral leadership."

In person, Johnson could be very impressive. His technique of personal persuasion, an overpowering hard-sell of cajolery and bullying, was almost irresistible, and many strong-minded men, including George Wallace, buckled under it. Even Bobby Kennedy called him "a very formidable man" after a meeting. He was also both clever and intelligent. Richard Nixon has called him "one of the greatest political craftsmen of our time," and J. K. Galbraith said of him: "He's genuinely intelligent, imaginative, flexible, and he wants to do things." James Reston described him as "one of the most eloquent and persuasive advocates of this generation." He could be a prodigious and effective campaigner.

But in addressing himself to the whole nation, Johnson did not always achieve the full status of his office. Whether because of his regional mannerisms, accent, or old Senate habits of secretiveness and even double-talk, he sometimes had problems of communication, but he was also the victim of what the New York Times called "vulgar snobbery," and the credibility gap was an almost entirely phony issue. Johnson was as forthright as most Presidents and more so

than many, (including Roosevelt, who was saved, however, by managing to sound like an apostle even when he was lying). But Johnson's critics, in one of history's most effective and insidious hatchet jobs, managed to sow mistrust between the people and their President.

Johnson's abdication, like that of Cinncinnatus, was a classic example of the voluntary surrender of great power, a very dramatic act, in history as in the theatre. All knew that a titan had passed whose like would not be seen again. His talents, his ego, his compassion, determination and capacity for work, were, like his services to the nation and his much-caricatured ears, very prominent.

And so an epoch in American and world affairs which only began with the intercession of tragedy, ended prematurely, and the plane in which Lyndon Baines Johnson was inaugurated President at Dallas, and which carried him and the corpse and the widow of his predecessor back to Washington in 1963, carried him also back to Texas at the end of his public days in 1969. Thousands bade the President a friendly farewell at Washington airport, and the largest and most appropriate sign they held aloft read: "Vaya con Dios, L.B.J."

COUNTRY WILL APPROVE CANCELLATION OF DRAFT CALLS

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Wichita, Kans., Eagle, which presents the positive aspects of the actions taken by President Nixon relating to the draft. Congress now has an opportunity to take constructive steps to correct inequities in the draft by acting on the recommendations which the administration has made. The editorial follows:

COUNTRY WILL APPROVE CANCELLATION OF DRAFT CALLS

It is sure to be said that President Nixon's curtailment of the draft and the announcement of additional Vietnam troop withdrawals were calculated to "cool" campus unrest as the new school year begins.

Few Americans—especially the students—will complain whatever the motives.

The President's cancellation of November and December draft calls and the spacing out of the induction of men already called to less than 10,000 a month came very close to an outright two-month suspension of the draft.

This, and his announced withdrawal of 35,000 additional troops from the Vietnam war zone by mid-December cannot help but calm opponents of the war.

The President has made a positive move in the interim before Congress can act on his proposals for overhaul of the draft, and at least 32,000 additional young Americans will be home for Christmas who might have spent the holidays in a foxhole in Vietnam.

In addition, the January draft call, now programmed for 35,000 men, will be reviewed in December with a view toward a possible cutback.

The Administration, meanwhile, will try to achieve draft reform through an executive order that would become effective the first of the year.

The latest troop withdrawals and the draft curtailment coincide with Mr. Nixon's address to the United Nations in which he urged the 126 member nations to use their best diplomatic efforts to persuade North Vietnam to move seriously into the negotiations which could end the war.

No one knows what the practical effect of these actions will be, ultimately, but the President is not content to sit idly and let the problems mount.

He is doing what he can, it seems, to move the country a little closer to peace at home and abroad.

NARCOTICS: MANY PROBLEMS, NO SOLUTIONS

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, a commonly asked question today is, "Why cannot the police stop the drug traffic?" The problem is intensely complicated and there are no easy answers. This third article by Richard Severo in the New York Times lends considerable insight into the problem and analyzes some of the solutions. I commend it to you:

POLICE VIEW OF ADDICT CONTROL: ONLY PROBLEMS, NOT SOLUTIONS

(By Richard Severo with the assistance of Barbara Campbell, third of a series)

"Why can't the police stop the drug traffic?"

The question is heard all over New York these days, asked with almost as much frequency at Midtown cocktail parties as on the front stoops of Brownsville, Harlem and Hunts Point.

Although Federal and local agents have sloughed their way to impressive hauls of heroin and have arrested some distributors, the drug is as easy to get in New York as it ever was.

Law-enforcement officials offer several explanations for the easy access to heroin, chiefly lack of manpower. The 120 Federal narcotics agents working in and around New York record prodigious hours of overtime each week; the narcotics squad of the New York City Police Department has 480 men at full strength, less than 2 per cent of the city's total police manpower.

Yet even the police concede that the solution does not lie just in additional manpower—or even in more arrests and drug seizures. One precinct commander in the Bronx, who asked to remain anonymous, noted ruefully that during periods when heroin was hard to get on the streets (junkies call these times "panics"), the price went up and confirmed addicts then had to steal even more than they usually do.

As for effectively "sealing" United States borders to heroin grown abroad and smuggled here, no law-enforcement official interviewed during the preparation of this series thought it was remotely feasible.

Deputy Chief John B. McCahey of the Narcotics Squad estimated, for example, that one medium-sized oceangoing freighter has about 35,000 places in which heroin could be hidden. A kilo of heroin, worth \$20,000 to \$25,000 wholesale in New York, can easily be tucked into the space of a shoe box.

"It is impossible," says Chief McCahey, "to check everything."

Clearly, too many factors overseas, where the poppies are grown from which heroin is made, are outside police control. The domestic control problem is complicated by lapses

in communication among local and Federal law-enforcement agencies, which sometimes seem to regard one another as rivals rather than participants in a common cause.

LOCAL PROBLEMS CITED

The problem is complicated in the New York area by these factors:

Drug addicts accused of crimes are violating parole and bail privileges in discouragingly large numbers and are not showing up in court to face charges. The addicts then presumably continue to steal to buy heroin. A study by the Vero Institute of Justice, a private agency that seeks court reform in New York, showed that in a group of addicts in the Bronx 37 per cent "failed to appear" when their cases were called. The study also said that "it is quite likely that the actual default rate among addicts is higher than this, because a number of crimes with which addicts are commonly associated were not included in the study."

Despite the efforts of top police officials, there was no perceptible, uniform policy for attacking the drug problem at the precinct level. One precinct commander said it made no sense to arrest pushers; another said he pursued pushers but not users. Other police officers said it made little sense to deal with either pusher or addict, and still others said they thought there was merit in applying pressure on both pusher and addict in the street.

In slum neighborhoods, suspicion of the relationship between the police and drug pushers is wide spread. Sources within the Police Department said that some of their colleagues were taking bribes and that the department was not doing enough to clean itself up.

HIGH OFFICERS CRITICIZED

"The breakdown in law and order does not start on the street," said one detective, who asked that his name not be used. "It starts at a very high level in the Police Department where top brass protect the department, whether it's right or wrong."

An unevenness in police service was observed in some neighborhoods. In several instances the police failed to respond to telephone calls from residents that might have enabled them to apprehend drug addicts in the process of stealing.

Stolen property is being purchased from drug addicts in beauty parlors, bars and slum gambling houses, in poor neighborhoods, in some instances by the very residents who are complaining most about the conduct of the police. Moreover, because they distrust the police and also fear retribution from pushers and addicts, these same people are most reluctant to testify to the crimes they have witnessed in the streets.

In its study of bail-jumping among addicts, the Vero Institute found that almost half the addicts who failed to show up "had not returned to court during the nine months after default." The analysis was based on a four-month study of 339 addict defendants in the Bronx Criminal Court in March of 1968.

The problem of addicts who violate bail or parole worries the police, who feel that most addicts, when free, will continue to steal to support their habits.

Bronx District Attorney Burton B. Roberts feels that suspected addicts should be denied bail and treated in much the same way as a person suspected of being a psychotic. "Both the addict and the psychotic can do great damage both to themselves and to society," he said.

PRE-TRIAL DETENTION OPPOSED

The Vero study did not advocate pre-trial detention. It pointed out that while "37 per cent of the addict-defendants jumped, 63 per cent did not. A blanket policy of pre-trial detention would result in confinement of approximately two defendants who would not have jumped for each thwarted jumper."

The addict-defendants who were released in their own recognizance and thus posted no money jumped bail more often than those who had to post bond. The study reported that they failed to reappear at a rate 20 per cent greater than those addicts who had to post bail to get out.

These facts, the study said, suggest that a cash bail "may be a more effective deterrent to flight by a narcotically involved defendant than personal recognizance." But the analysis also emphasized that the posting of money alone cannot be the only factor in considering the problem of bail jumping.

At the present time, if a police officer thinks that the person he has arrested is a drug addict, he fills in a "CR-1" form in which he states that he observed the physical symptoms associated with the use of narcotics—scarred arms, dilated pupils, drowsiness.

But Vera contends that the CR-1 form is not a completely satisfactory way to identify addicts since "the police officer is not a medical expert and physical symptoms observed or thought to be observed, by him are not clinical proof . . ."

SHORTCOMINGS OF SYSTEM

The lack of a precise means of identifying addicts, according to Vera, "hampers the ability of the administrators of justice to give proper consideration at the bail-setting stage to a large percentage of defendants, including both those who are in fact addicts but are not identified as such, and those who are erroneously assumed to be addicts."

Vera says that in the present New York criminal court system, "it is all but certain that many addicts pass through the system unidentified, even though substantial proof of addiction may be available."

The study said that a means must be found to inform judges about the drug use of a defendant he may consider for bail, and urged consideration of a plan under which suspected addicts would receive physical examinations before they were arraigned. "Obviously," the study said, "a number of serious legal and medical questions would have to be met before a judgment on the feasibility of such a procedure could be made."

District Attorney Roberts, alarmed at the rise in the last few years of serious crimes committed by addicts, feels those questions must be answered soon. In recent weeks he has been advocating a plan that would deny bail to anyone suspected of being an addict. The plan would work this way:

If an arresting policeman has "probable cause" to believe someone is a drug addict, the defendant would be taken to Rikers Island penitentiary immediately after arraignment, promptly tested by doctors for heroin in his urine, then re-arraigned in a court facility set up at Rikers Island.

If doctors concluded that the defendant was an addict and if the defendant was not a hardened criminal and wished to confirm the doctor's report, he would be considered for a civil commitment to a facility run by the State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission.

If the man was accused of a serious crime he would have to be tried within 90 days. If for any reason he was not tried within 90 days, bail would have to be set.

If the defendant wished to contest the findings and claim he was not an addict, a hearing would have to be held within four weeks "before a judge who would make a determination if there is probable cause to detain the defendant without bail as an addict."

Mario A. Procaccino, the Democratic candidate, for Mayor, issued a narcotics policy statement Tuesday that embraced most of Mr. Roberts's ideas and also proposed a massive, voluntary methadone program. Methadone, a synthetic addictive drug that blocks the desire for heroin in many addicts, would

be given to any addict who wanted it under Mr. Procaccino's program.

OBJECTIONS TO ROBERTS PLAN

A New York Supreme Court justice and several lawyers, all of whom asked to remain anonymous, were asked what they thought of Mr. Roberts's plan. They raised these objections:

Under the Roberts plan a policeman would have the discretion to determine who might be an addict. Policemen are not qualified to do this. Moreover, they could interpret "probable cause" to harass suspected criminals who might or might not be either criminals or addicts.

The Roberts plan would come into affect only after heroin addicts were caught in the commission of a crime. It says nothing of the tens of thousands who are never caught.

The facilities of the State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission have come under criticism recently as being more custodial than rehabilitative.

If addicts were to be accorded all the guarantees of law, including the right to choose counsel at arraignment, the problem of getting a private lawyer to Rikers Island in time for arraignment would be serious.

Since the court system is woefully overloaded now, it is doubtful that it could really dispose of all addiction hearings within four weeks and trials within 90 days.

POLICE DISAGREE ON TACTICS

Along with the disagreement among legal authorities is the lack of agreement among the police themselves on how to cope with heroin addicts.

In the Brownsville section of Brooklyn Capt. John E. Wilson of the 73d Precinct (an area with probably thousands of addicts) feels that arresting pushers is an ineffective way of dealing with the problem because "somebody takes his place."

But Capt. George S. Cerrone of the 75th Precinct in the East New York section of Brooklyn says he believes in arresting pushers to "dry up the source." Deputy Inspector Anthony J. McNally of the 41st Precinct in the Hunts Point section of the Bronx says he thinks it makes sense to arrest the pusher but not the user.

Other police officers said they felt it was a waste of time to arrest either pushers or users because the real powers in the drug trade went untouched. A few other policemen said they thought it was necessary to keep the pressure on both pushers and addicts so that no neighborhood would become an easy mark for them.

Some policemen expressed reluctance to make drug and other arrests in slum neighborhoods because of what they considered a lack of support from the community.

"All I have to do is tell one whore to move on," complained one Bronx patrolman, "and around here, I'd have 50 people yelling police brutality."

POLICE PROMISED MORE FUNDS

Mayor Lindsay recently announced that he wanted the police to intensify their efforts against the drug traffic. He indicated that he felt the problem heretofore was complicated by a lack of funds for narcotics operations and pledged that more money would be provided.

What would be an arrestable offense in some sections of the city goes almost unnoticed in others.

A visitor to the Hunts Point section (called Fort Apache by some of the embattled residents) observed at least three instances in which the police did not respond to calls that would have enabled them to catch addict-burglars at work.

On one occasion in early July a woman saw several young neighborhood heroin users on the roof of a building at the corner of Tiffany Street and Southern Boulevard. They were carrying a portable television set, a toaster and an iron. Although she telephoned

the police three times, they never responded. The junkies got away.

IMMEDIATE RESPONSE

On another occasion, when the same woman saw a policeman who appeared to be on the verge of having serious trouble with a small crowd at the same intersection, she called the 41st Precinct, which dispatched a squad car almost instantly.

Deputy Inspector Anthony J. McNally of the 41st Precinct said he believed his men were responding to calls as quickly as possible.

However, a Roman Catholic priest who used to work in Hunts Point thought that local policemen there "regard Hunts Point as a garbage can and they think their only job is to keep the top on it and not let the garbage out."

On the Lower East Side, the leader of a street gang that is confronting addicts and pushers in the street said, "When you talk to kids around here about cops, they just laugh."

Members of the gang, some of them former heroin users, said that when the police conducted raids they did not always account for all the cash or all the drugs confiscated.

Harold Rothwax, a lawyer for Mobilization for Youth who has represented some poor defendants accused of possessing narcotics, said that some of his clients have told him that they had more heroin in their possession than they were charged with having. "I see no reason why they would not tell me the truth about that sort of thing," Mr. Rothwax said.

He said there was a feeling in some neighborhoods that the police kept some heroin either to sell themselves or perhaps to plant on a particular suspect they wanted to arrest.

LOYALTY AND BRIBERY

Harold Foner, a criminal lawyer who represents the 3,300-member Traffic Squad Benevolent Association, said: "There is an awful lot of bribery. The department, out of a mistaken kind of loyalty, protects these men."

"Policemen who take bribes know they can't be prosecuted. It's practically impossible. That's why they do it. Once you're labeled an addict or a prostitute, even if you tell the truth, nobody will believe you."

A spokesman for the Police Department declined to comment on the criticism.

Another internal problem of law enforcement concerns the degree of cooperation among Federal and local officials. And although Federal and city police agencies say they are cooperating, there appear to be some communications gaps between them.

Deputy Chief McCahey pointed out that the New York City Narcotics Squad maintained liaison with Federal narcotics agents. But he also conceded that the liaison did not include the exchange of briefings on specific current cases. The result is that Federal and local agents could be working on the same leads and not know about it. But Chief McCahey added: "I don't know that this has ever happened."

FBI FEARS DISCLOSURES

Sources in the Federal Bureau of Investigation said they feared disclosure of information by inept or corrupt local lawmen. Other F.B.I. sources conceded the existence of a continuing rivalry between the F.B.I. and agents of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, although it is perhaps diminishing.

A new Federal-city task force was set up in July to deal with the narcotics problem. It is composed of Federal narcotics agents, customs inspectors and New York police. Among other things, the task force hopes to utilize existing resources more efficiently.

But whatever the internal problems of enforcement may be, it would be inaccurate to blame these alone for the formidable drug problem that exists in so many New York neighborhoods.

Part of the problem lies within the neighborhoods. In Harlem, for example, junkies find it relatively easy to sell stolen merchandise to church-going middle-class residents who deplore the lawlessness that surrounds them.

A Harlem drug addict who estimated that he stole more than \$400 worth of goods each week to support his habit said that one of the easiest places to dispose of stolen merchandise was in Harlem beauty salons.

"Let's face it," he said, "people up there aren't exactly the wealthiest people in New York. If some housewife can pick up a brand-new television set for \$15, she'd be a damned fool to turn it down so that she could pay \$200 in a store."

The head of a Bronx antipoverty unit who is highly critical of police behavior admitted to a reporter that he recently purchased 50 pounds of spareribs that had been stolen by drug addicts from a warehouse.

NOW I'M SORRY

"I can tell you now I'm sorry I did it," the man said. "But when the spareribs were offered to me at such a low price I rationalized it, saying: 'Well, you may as well buy them. If you don't, somebody else will.'"

The task of keeping heroin out of the country remains much as it has always been: overwhelming.

Turkey is still the major source of illicit heroin. William J. Durkin, regional director of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, estimated that 80 to 85 per cent of the heroin sold in this country originated in Turkish poppy fields.

The poppies in Turkey are grown ostensibly for the manufacture of morphine, which is used as a pain killer all over the world. Though acreage used for this purpose is regulated by the Turkish Government, Mr. Durkin pointed out that it is relatively easy for a farmer in Turkey or any place else to exceed his quota, and it is extraordinarily difficult for police to catch him. The country is vast; the numbers of policemen checking on farmers are few.

Other current sources of heroin are Communist China, Thailand, Burma, Laos and Mexico. There is no poppy growing in the United States.

Marseilles, France, and Beirut, Lebanon, remain centers of narcotics traffic. In and around both cities, small "factories" exist where the raw opium is transformed first into a morphine base and then into heroin, the preferred form of the drug in the United States.

MARKUP ON HEROIN

At present, a kilo of good quality heroin costs about \$4,000 in Marseilles. The same kilo is worth six times that amount to wholesalers in New York. By the time it reaches the street, passing through many hands, the original kilo cut (diluted) and recut, sells by the milligram. A \$3 bag contains about 7.5 milligrams of heroin. This constitutes an astronomical markup.

Mr. Durkin estimated that 1,500 to 2,500 kilograms of heroin came into the United States in 1968, much of it through New York, the biggest single point in world narcotics traffic, both in terms of consumption and distribution.

Asked why French and Lebanese police do not shut the factories down, Mr. Durkin explained that the factories were both small and mobile and thus hard to find. He said that police abroad—as here—must have some basis for obtaining warrants to conduct raids, and evidence is hard to get.

ROLE OF THE MAFIA

Mr. Durkin said that although members of the Mafia with large bankrolls played a major role in the international drug trade, they were by no means alone. A number of Latin Americans are also in the business, probably independent of the Mafia, he said, as well as a major narcotics ring in Australia that has nothing to do with the Mafia.

The Federal Narcotics Bureau maintains bureaus in many cities abroad. These include Paris, where many of the Marseilles heroin runners live; Lima, Peru, now a center for cocaine traffic; Seoul, South Korea, a distribution point for heroin sold to U.S. servicemen in Asia; Hong Kong, a major relay point for heroin originating in Communist China that is bound for the United States; and Bangkok, Thailand, a relay point for heroin made in Thailand and Laos.

Federal agents are also stationed in Rome, where some deportees from the United States have engaged in drug traffic, Beirut and Marseilles.

In New York, Mr. Durkin's men concentrate on levels higher than the street pusher. He believes that getting pushers off the streets all over the city would require a saturation level of local police. And such a mobilization of manpower to fight the onslaught of heroin at present seems unlikely.

CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AS COMPARED WITH BUFFALO, N.Y.

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the skyrocketing crime rate in the District of Columbia is a matter of serious concern.

This week the FBI reported that robberies here increased 46 percent in the first 6 months of this year while the increase for the Nation as a whole was 17 percent compared with the first 6 months of last year.

The District also far outdistanced the Nation as a whole in the case of murder and nonnegligent manslaughter. The Nation increased 8 percent while the District increase was 42 percent. Murders in the District climbed from 88 to 125. Rapes rose from 100 to 150; aggravated assault from 1,489 to 1,725; and burglary, breaking and entering climbed from 8,829 to 10,107. These statistics are all disappointing in view of the pledge made in the last campaign by President Nixon to make the Nation's Capital a model city with regard to crime.

Washington's record during the first half of 1969 contrasts sharply with the crime record of Buffalo, N.Y., during the same timespan.

There, a sharp drop in crime was reported. Crimes of violence in the first half of this year were 826—down 66 from the same 1968 period. Crimes against property were recorded at 6,228—a drop of 844 from the same period a year earlier. The number of rapes was listed at 67—down 14 from a year earlier. Automobile thefts fell markedly from 2,423 in the first 6 months of 1968 to 1,638 in the first half of this year. In four of the seven major categories listed by the FBI, Buffalo registered a similar drop. And in one of these categories, murder, there were 17 in the first 6 months of this year as compared to 16 in the same period last year.

Naturally I am proud of this record of my hometown, Mr. Speaker, although we are determined to do even better in the future in the matter of reducing

crime. I believe that the police officials in the District of Columbia could benefit from a conference with their counterparts in the city of Buffalo.

DRUGS: PART 1—OUR CHILDREN ARE TURNING ON

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, do we really know the scope of the drug problem in the United States? Is marihuana addictive? Does its use automatically lead to more dangerous drugs?

The answers to these and other questions are necessary before this Government proceeds to absolve or incarcerate anyone for use of drugs.

But, except for some unrecognized forays by individual scholars, there have been no comprehensive studies of marihuana and its effects. This information could be obtained by a Presidential committee similar to the Kerner Commission.

In calling my colleagues' attention to the need for such a commission, I would like to introduce into the RECORD, a series of four articles which appeared in the Pittsburgh Point on consecutive weeks beginning June 26.

These articles discuss the drug problem in general and some of the specific aberrations in Pittsburgh.

A good friend of mine—and of many Pittsburghers—Dr. Emil Trellis, provided much of the background for these pieces. Dr. Trellis has worked with narcotic addicts in Pittsburgh and elsewhere, including the Federal hospital in Lexington.

Parenthetically, the title of the third of these articles, "The Failure of Laws and Programs," could aptly describe our current "more jails and stiffer penalties" approach to narcotics and their increasing use.

The articles referred to follow:

DRUGS: PART 1—OUR CHILDREN ARE TURNING ON

(By Richard Rieker)

All of a sudden—so it seems—everyone is talking about drugs. Books and articles on the "drug culture" proliferate. The popular press, often in nearly hysterical tones, warns of the growing menace of teenage addiction. Political candidates are asked to take a position on drug laws. Legislators debate everything from repeal of drug laws to greatly increased penalties.

What is everybody so excited about? Drug addiction has been with us for a long time. Has it suddenly become a major problem? Or is it, rather, just a symptom of the general malaise of the country?

This and the articles which will follow will attempt to discuss, though not answer, those questions and others as well. For example, what are these "drugs" that everyone is talking about? How do they differ from each other, and are they all equally harmful? And who are the "addicts," and how do they differ from each other? What has society tried to do about drug addiction, besides impose penalties? What should be done?

Needless to say, this series will not be a definitive treatise on drug addiction. All I

hope to do is bring some perspective to this complex problem, without adding to the confusion.

Emil S. Trellis is a psychiatrist. In 1961, following his residency at Western Psychiatric Institute, he went to the U.S. Public Health Service Hospital at Lexington, Ky., where for two years he was psychiatric chief of the Women's Addiction Service. From 1963 to 1967 Dr. Trellis was director of the Narcotics Addiction Treatment Program of Western Pennsylvania, a pilot program which he developed. From July, 1967, until recently he was director of the Hill District Mental Health Team of the Community Mental Health Center at Western Psychiatric Institute. He is a clinical assistant professor at WPI. He is in private practice, in the course of which he sees many young people who "use drugs."

Despite all his experience with drug addiction, Dr. Trellis has no easy answers, and he is upset by those who have. In a recent interview I asked him why there was suddenly so much concern over drug abuse. His answer: "Prior to the mid-Sixties nobody gave a damn about drugs because it was a 'black' problem. The drug getting the most attention was heroin, and it was being used by blacks and Puerto Ricans and Mexican-Americans out of all proportion to their numbers. When heroin use increased among juveniles after World War Two, our answer was to pass the punitive legislation of the Fifties. All that did was to increase the number of addicts in the federal prisons. There was still no real concern. But now—now hundreds of thousands of middle class and suburban kids are fooling with marijuana. These are 'our children' who are facing a felony conviction for possession and sale of marijuana, 'our children' who could end up with a record—and the country's hysterical."

Trellis is also unhappy about newspaper articles which use scare techniques to "alert" the public to the drug problem. "The Pittsburgh Press carried a series by Dr. Max Rafferty recently. Dr. Rafferty told the parents that it was all their fault, that they were too permissive. He wants the parents to play cops-and-robbers with their kids, to know what they have in their rooms and so on. Other people are telling parents to check their children's skin pallor and whether their pupils are dilated. That's a terrific way to build a relationship based on trust!"

"Some well-meaning people," he went on, "want to put classes in the schools at all levels, to teach the children not to use drugs. The trouble with that is that the young people most likely to use drugs are the most anti-social, the least likely to respond to authority. School in the usual sense may be the last place to teach them anything. But if we are going to use the schools, let's not teach them about drugs—let's teach them not to kill, not to suicide, not to hurt others or themselves."

Trellis said that he had seen several films which were supposed to turn children off drugs. "One was called 'The Decision.' It was awful, out-of-date and absurd. The kids laughed. There was another one that probably did nothing but turn the kids on sexually—the blood, the tourniquet, pushing the needle in, pulling it out, and so on. And some of these films are too informative: I never knew how to sniff glue until I saw a movie about it."

Information alone is not the answer, Trellis said. "I've seen four young girls in private practice, all pregnant. Intellectually they all knew about contraception and ovulation, but not emotionally. It's the same thing with drugs."

THE PROBLEM IN PERSPECTIVE

Is drug abuse among young people a real problem? "It's a real problem," Trellis said, "but it's not the major problem of our time. The trouble is that by focusing on drug abuse we can ignore the really major prob-

lems. We can ignore the fact that 35,000 Americans have died in Vietnam, and God knows how many Vietnamese. We can forget that 160 cities burned after the death of Martin Luther King, and all we've done is build up the police and the National Guard. There are 800,000 people on relief in New York City, but we don't think about that because drugs—"dope" when you want to be more sensational—has become a major issue. We can forget about Appalachia or the American Indian or the fact that in the wealthiest country in the world there are children suffering from malnutrition comparable to what you can see in Biafra. All we can see is that 'our children' are using drugs. We're using drugs the same way some of them are—to cop out."

"Instead of thinking so much about drugs," Trellis said, "we should be thinking about adolescence—what does it mean to be an adolescent? We should remember that adolescence is a time for developing independence, for learning how to form relationships, particularly heterosexual ones. We should consider that adolescence is a time of protest—against parents, school, society—and we should be asking how drug-use relates to that protest. Is drug-use worse than other kinds of acting-out behavior? Is it worse than drinking too much, or promiscuous sex, or reckless driving, or falling in school? My practice is in the South Hills. I know of young people from there who drive to West Virginia, get drunk, and drive back, maybe 90 miles an hour. Is drug-taking worse than that? We kill 50,000 people a year on the highways, and alcohol is involved in maybe half of those deaths. Why don't we get excited about that?"

"We can't just talk about 'drugs,'" Trellis continued. "There are all sorts of drugs, just as there are all kinds of people who take them. We have to be specific. We have to ask who is taking what and why. And we even have to entertain the idea that not all drug-use may be 'bad.' We have to ask how a drug experience has been integrated into a given person's life style—has it been harmful or helpful?"

"Young people all over the country are protesting," Trellis said. "They're resisting the draft, saying they'd rather go to jail than to Vietnam. They're disrupting campuses. And they're taking drugs. Maybe they're playing a game with the drugs—and we're focusing on the drugs and missing what they're really saying."

"We have the force, or we can get the force, to put down all this protest," Trellis said. "But it might be too costly in the long run, because the casualties will be 'our children.'"

DRUGS: PART 2—WE ARE ALL "USERS"

(By Richard Rieker)

There were 48,535 addicts known to the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs as of December 31, 1963. At year-end 1967 the figure had risen to 62,045. The 1967 figure for Pennsylvania was 1656, including 251 "new" names added during the year.

The age breakdown of the total number of known addicts for 1967 was as follows: under 17, .2 per cent; 18-20, 3.4 per cent; 21-30, 45.8 per cent; 31-40, 37 per cent; over 40, 13.6 per cent.

Figures for 1968 are not yet available, but Bureau officials estimate that the total will be nearly 64,000. The Bureau gets its statistics primarily from the arrest records of federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies. Almost all of the addicts known to the Bureau have been arrested for using "hard" narcotics—heroin and, to a much lesser extent, cocaine. Some Bureau officials feel that their statistics reflect only about half of the actual hard narcotics used in the United States.

The people known to the Bureau are called "addicts." That term, of course, has been in

common use for a long time—but what exactly does it mean? What is "drug addiction"?

The World Health Organization has proposed the following definition of drug addiction:

A state of periodic and chronic intoxication detrimental to the individual and to society, produced by the repeated consumption of a drug (narcotic or synthetic). Its characteristics include: (1) an overpowering desire or need (compulsion) to continue taking the drug, and to obtain it by any means; (2) a tendency to increase the dose; and (3) a psychic (psychological) and sometimes a physical dependence on the effects of the drugs.

A much more detailed description of the characteristics of addiction may be found in *The Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis* by Dr. Otto Fenichel (New York: W. W. Norton, 1945). This is a textbook used in psychiatric training. Dr. Fenichel discusses drug addiction in a chapter entitled "Perversions and Impulse Neuroses." He begins by saying, "The same urge that governs other pathological impulses is operative in addicts: the need to get something that is not merely sexual satisfaction but also security and assurance of self-assertion, and as such essential to the person's very existence. Addicts represent the most clear-cut type of 'impulsives.'"

Dr. Fenichel goes on to say that addicts are "fixated to a passive-narcissistic aim," interested solely in their own gratification. "Objects are nothing else for them but deliverers of supplies. Erogenously, the leading zones are the oral zone and the skin; self-esteem, even existence, are dependent on getting food and warmth."

The effect of the drug rests on the fact that it is felt as this food and warmth. Persons of this kind react to situations that create the need for sedation or stimulation differently from others. They are intolerant of tension. They cannot endure pain, frustration, situations of waiting. They seize any opportunity for escape more readily and may experience the effect of the drug as something much more gratifying than the original situation that had been interrupted by the precipitating pain or frustration. After the elation, pain or frustration becomes all the more unbearable, inducing a heightened use of the drug. All other strivings become gradually more and more replaced by the 'pharmacotoxic longing.' Interests in reality gradually disappear, except those having to do with procuring the drug. In the end, all of reality may come to reside in the hypodermic needle. The tendency toward such a development, rooted in an oral dependence on outer supplies, is the essence of drug addiction. All other features are incidental.

With the above definitions in mind, let us look at some items which appeared in the May, 1969, issue of the Drug Law Bulletin, a new publication of the U.S. National Student Association.

Dr. John Talbott, after spending one year with a neuro-psychiatric team in Vietnam, estimated that 50 per cent of the troops use marijuana. Only one to five per cent of psychiatric drug admissions are marijuana-related, he reports; the biggest medical problem is still alcohol.

According to the Wall Street Journal, liquor consumption for 1968 was estimated to be 342,000,000 gallons, up 5 per cent from 1967.

Preliminary findings of the four-year study being conducted by Dr. Hugh V. Perry of George Washington University, which does not include marijuana, narcotics, or psychedelics, indicates that at least half of the adult population of the United States uses stimulants, depressants and tranquilizers.

What are we to say of all this consumption of marijuana, pills, and liquor? Surely all of these people are not "addicts." But if not, how are we to describe them (ourselves?)?

In recent years physicians and psychia-

trists have developed the concept of "drug dependence," which is meant to include both "addiction" and "habituation." In an article entitled "Medical Management of Drug Dependence" (Journal of the American Medical Association, 11/11/68), Dr. Philip Solomon, a psychiatrist, defined the terms.

The word "drug" is now widely used to mean only those highly active substances taken for pleasurable, rather than therapeutic, purposes, usually with the implication of illicitness and danger. Aspirin, digitalis, etc., are now called "medicines." The term "drug dependence" includes addiction (which implies tissue dependence, tolerance, and withdrawal symptoms) and habituation (which specifies the continuing nature of the drug taking and implies psychological rather than physiological dependence). One may become addicted to heroin and other opium derivatives (narcotics), habituated to barbiturates, or dependent on any of these or on psychedelic drugs (lysergic acid, diethylamide [LSD], mescaline, peyote, etc.), amphetamines, alcohol, or marijuana.

Dr. Solomon divides drug dependence into three categories, according to intensity: social, neurotic, or psychotic; and he would presumably include any sort of drug-taking under one of these. Dr. Emil S. Trellis, who has been following the life-styles of drug-takers since 1962, agrees with the concept of drug dependence, but feels that it does not go quite far enough. He suggested an additional term, "drug use." "Drug use," he said, "might describe the taking of a substance by a person who is addicted or dependent, but it could also refer to a person who only casually or intermittently takes drugs. Take alcohol for example. When we take a drink we are involved in 'drug use.' We don't like to look at it that way but it's true. The difference between alcohol and, say, marijuana, in one sense at least, is that adult society sanctions the use of alcohol. We not only sanction it, we advertise and promote it. It's 'our thing.' But when the kids come and say marijuana is 'their thing' we say 'no.'"

(During one of our conversations, Dr. Trellis, who doesn't smoke, remarked that I, along with millions of other Americans, am "dependent" on cigarettes. Then we decided that we both "use" alcohol. We did not discuss our addictions.)

In general, Dr. Trellis is wary of all definitions. "We mustn't get hung up on them. Just defining a problem is not dealing with it." He believes that "medical models" are of limited value because they tend to ignore social factors: a strict adherence to the psychoanalytic model of an addict "would make such a person untreatable," he said.

THE DRUGS

When we turn to the drugs themselves, we find that people are sniffing, swallowing, smoking, or injecting into their bodies a fantastic variety of substances. Following is a list of the main categories of these substances (omitting some of the more exotic items, such as nutmeg), together with a brief description of their effect on the people who take them.

Narcotics. These are the pain-killers. They include morphine, demerol, dilaudid, percodan, methadone, paregoric, and others, all of which may be legally prescribed by a doctor; and heroin, which is illegal under any circumstances. Heroin is, nevertheless, the addict's "drug of choice"; it is also, of course, big business.

Persons using narcotics generally build up a tolerance for them, meaning that more and more of the drug must be used to get the desired effect. Depriving a narcotics addict of his drugs causes a withdrawal syndrome: running eyes and nose, nausea and vomiting, abdominal cramps and diarrhea, a mild temperature and chills, bone-ache, restlessness—something like a severe case of the flu. Death, however, is rare.

Contrary to the popular notion, narcotics

use suppresses drives, including sex and hunger. Many addicts have to force themselves to eat. Many female-addicts stop menstruating. Heroin addicts, particularly, may have all sorts of associated health problems—scarred arms and legs, tooth decay, skin abscesses, phlebitis, and (from a "dirty" needle) hepatitis, syphilis, tetanus, nonspecific bloodstream infections, and inflammation of the lining of the heart. Children of addicts may be born addicted; Dr. Trellis has withdrawn a baby born of an addict mother.

According to Dr. Trellis, it is hard to draw an accurate addiction-and-withdrawal picture of a typical heroin addict because of the variation among bags of heroin. A given bag of "heroin" may contain anywhere from zero to 20 per cent heroin, the balance being sugar, quinine, baking soda, etc.

Barbiturates

These drugs depress the central nervous system, hence they are most commonly used as sedatives. Over-use may produce intoxication similar to that produced by alcohol—a feeling of being "high," dizziness, impairment of coordination and judgment, coma, and, in some cases, death from paralysis of the respiratory center. They are commonly misused along with alcohol, increasing the chances of damage or death. Barbiturate intoxication can lead to such things as falling down stairs, dropping cigarettes in bed, automobile accidents, etc. The withdrawal syndrome related to barbiturates includes the possibility of convulsions; deaths have been reported as a result of continuous convulsions. Psychological disturbances, such as confusion, disorientation, and hallucinations can also result. Cardiovascular collapse, while rare, has happened during withdrawal.

The addiction-withdrawal pattern of barbiturates may also occur following the misuse of certain non-barbiturate sleeping pills, or certain tranquilizers—e.g., Valium, Librium, Milltown—commonly used in medical practice.

Amphetamines

These drugs are powerful stimulants to the central nervous system. In medicine, they are commonly used by "diet doctors" to suppress appetite, and are sometimes used to treat narcolepsy (intense desire to sleep). They are also used, paradoxically, to treat hyperactive children. They are commonly misused by, for example, truck drivers and students, to help them stay awake. A regular user of amphetamines can develop a tolerance for them. As with the barbiturates, various emotional disturbances, such as confusion or disorientation, may occur, sometimes involving hallucinations and feelings of persecution. Persons under the influence of amphetamines have often been brought to psychiatric emergency rooms with symptoms indistinguishable from acute paranoid-schizophrenia. In some instances, misuse of amphetamines has been connected with both homicide and suicide. There is no characteristic withdrawal syndrome, but depression has been found to occur in some cases; occasionally the depression is severe enough for the person to consider suicide.

Psychodelics

These drugs and substances produce a profound change in consciousness. The best known is LSD; the group also includes mescaline, peyote, a certain type of morning-glory seed, and a group of new chemical substances, among which are DMT, DTS, and STP. Use of these drugs may cause changes in perception involving all the senses—the now-famous "trip." Some users of psychodelics have claimed new and significant insights or new abilities in solving problems. Others have become panicky, utterly confused, or profoundly depressed, to the extent that they required psychiatric hospitalization. "Flashbacks"—recurrence of symptoms—have been known to take place as long as six months after a person has stopped taking the

drug. Questions about the possible effect of LSD on chromosomes have been raised, but thus far there is little clinical information.

Glue et al.

Sniffing glue, lighter fluid, paint thinner, gasoline, etc., can produce emotional changes similar to those obtained from alcohol, as well as more severe types of confusion, hallucination, or delusion (e.g., "I can fly!"). While these inhalants are not addictive as such, people can become dependent on them. Beyond this there is the remote possibility of liver and kidney damage, and suppression of the ability of bone marrow to produce red blood cells. There is at least one reported case of brain damage. Deaths associated with the use of these inhalants are usually by suffocation from using plastic bags, or by accidents resulting from impaired judgment.

Cough medicines

Various non-prescription cough medicines are sought for their alcohol and codeine content. Alcohol content may range from 3.5 per cent (comparable to most beer) to 40 per cent; codeine content is usually one grain per ounce. Cough medicine is sometimes used by heroin addicts when heroin is unavailable, in an attempt to avoid withdrawal symptoms; more often it is used for the codeine-alcohol "high."

Marijuana

This much-discussed plant is listed here separately because there is great disagreement among experts as to its nature and effect. Legally it is included with narcotics, but according to Dr. Trellis it is unlike narcotics pharmacologically in that it gives little relief from physical pain, tolerance does not occur, and it is not addicting.

A great deal remains to be learned about marijuana. Its main pharmacologic ingredient, tetrahydrocannabinol (THC), has been isolated only within the past couple of years. The amount of THC per unit of marijuana varies considerably, which may account in part for the variation in the effects of the drug. Marijuana does distort perception, but the extent varies from person to person and from time to time; it also varies with the social setting. Users tend to handle these distortions in keeping with their general emotional stability. Thus, while some people smoke marijuana without any apparent bad effect, others have been admitted to psychiatric hospitals in an acute psychotic state following marijuana use. Marijuana dependence can render a user relatively ineffectual socially or intellectually. Whether this is a function of the marijuana or the emotional make-up of the user is not known.

A major point of contention is the question of whether marijuana leads to heroin or other "hard" drugs. Physicians tend to say no, citing the absence of any clinical evidence. Law enforcement officials counter by pointing out that the majority of heroin-users admit to having smoked marijuana at one time. Dr. Trellis feels that the cause and effect relationship has not been proved. "It should be kept in mind," he said, "that the great majority of heroin-users come from communities where not only is heroin endemic, but so is marijuana, so is wine-drinking among young people, so is juvenile petty crime and every other kind of anti-social behavior. It's no big surprise that heroin-users 'started' with marijuana, but it simply doesn't follow that one drug leads to another."

In Trellis's view, the best reason for not smoking marijuana is that it's against the law. And because there are some serious unanswered questions about it, he is not for legalizing it. But he would like to have the penalty reduced to a misdemeanor.

Alcohol

An alcoholic's withdrawal can result in convulsions and delirium tremens (DT's).

WHY?

Perhaps the most important question to ask about drugs is: why? Why do people take all these things? The reasons are obviously so varied and so complex that one is tempted to answer: life—and let it go at that. But even if there are no answers, there are clues which should be explored.

Statistics can provide one clue. Of the 62,045 addicts listed by the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs in 1967, 30,815, or 49.7 percent, were listed as black; 30,881, or 49.8 percent, were listed as white. The black population of the United States has been estimated at about ten percent of the total, yet in 1967 almost exactly half of the known narcotics addicts were black.

Going back a little further, in 1963 the FBNDD included an ethnic breakdown in its statistics (a practice which has apparently been discontinued). Of the 48,535 known addicts for that year, Negroes made up 53.8 percent; Puerto Ricans, 11.7 percent; "Mexicans," 6.6 percent; all other Caucasians, 26.9 percent; all others, .7 percent.

To Emil Trellis, these statistics tend to verify one of his major theses: that the heroin problem in the United States has been and is a "black" problem, and that whites started paying attention to it only when their own children began using drugs. He is strongly convinced that we will never be able to deal with the drug problem as long as we ignore the social implications of racial or ethnic prejudice.

With this in mind, Trellis believes that we should look at drug use on three levels, which he calls intrapsychic, intrafamilial, and intrasocial. In other words, we should look at the psychological make-up of the individual drug-taker; we should look at him in relation to his family; and we should look at him and his family in the context of the larger society.

It is probably not possible to draw a psychological profile of a "typical" drug user. Speaking of narcotics addicts, however, Trellis feels that there are certain common characteristics which seem to cut across racial or socio-economic lines. "Most narcotics addicts," he said "are people who don't like themselves, who are not at peace with themselves. They're chronically depressed, life has no hope or meaning for them. They don't compete well. They don't do well at man-woman relationships; they're either exploitive or dependent. They don't relate well to authority figures. They have poor impulse control and little self-esteem. A great deal of their behavior is self-defeating."

"Here's an ironic thing," Trellis said. "Addicts don't trust anybody—yet an addict will buy a bag of 'dope' in the street, from somebody he doesn't really know, and hope that it's been properly 'cut'—otherwise he might die of an overdose. Besides, he has to think of his 'enemies'—people he's shortchanged on money or heroin, or people on whom he has informed—because in that case a small amount of rat poison or some other substance might be in the bag, and that could result in his death."

Trellis believes that in family relationships, psychological factors are more important than sociological ones. He said that in some families the relationship between parents and a child or children, or parent-child against other parent and/or children, results in emotional illness which may manifest itself as a neurotic pattern, or be an apparent factor in schizophrenia, or in severe self-defeating behavior, including the use of drugs.

At the societal level Trellis sees a pattern which is distinctly racial. He believes that conditions in ghettos would be sufficient in themselves to cause blacks, Puerto Ricans, and Mexican-Americans to have a high rate of narcotics use, even if psychological factors

were absent, which of course they aren't. "There's a whole syndrome in the ghetto," he said: "crime, delinquency, dropping out of school, illegitimacy, infant mortality, alcoholism, violence. Hope is low—or at least it was until Black Power came along. These are social conditions that are not usually found in white areas."

Trellis said that he was not able to draw a sociological profile of white narcotics users because the cross-section is too great. He did say that there are some small groups of mostly whites who use 100 per cent pure pharmaceutical narcotics. These include doctors and nurses; iatrogenic addicts—people suffering pain who are addicted knowingly or unknowingly by their doctors; and some anti-social people who forge prescriptions or buy them from corrupt doctors or pharmacists. Any of these people might turn eventually to heroin, Trellis said, but ordinarily they do not. And taken all together they do not constitute a major problem for society.

Heroin is the big problem, Trellis said, not only because it is addicting, but because getting it becomes a way of life. "Heroin costs about \$7 a bag," he said. "Consumption varies from a bag a week to six, eight, ten bags a day. A lot of addicts are out snatching and grabbing to get money to buy the stuff. Women are prostituting. There are addict couples who leave the house in the morning, just like anyone else, shoplift all day, and come back in the evening and ask each other, 'How'd you do today?'"

"Heroin traffic is big business, with tremendous profits," Trellis said. "And it's extremely hard to police. The social conditions which foster it are all around us in the cities. And the emotional needs of some people are very high."

DRUGS: PART 3—THE FAILURE OF LAWS AND PROGRAMS

(By Richard Rieker)

The federal government has been trying to regulate the importation and distribution of narcotics for more than 50 years. It has not succeeded; narcotics addiction is a serious and growing problem today. Other drugs, too, are being widely misused, despite federal and state prohibitions carrying severe penalties. Quite simply, the drug laws have failed.

Narcotics addiction treatment programs have also been tried (rather fitfully) over the years. Some of these have been government-sponsored, some private, some a combination. Statistically, in terms of the number of persons "cured," these programs, too, have failed. But some of the more recent of them do seem to have developed some promising methods of treatment.

THE LAWS

Prior to 1914 it was legal for a physician to prescribe narcotics for a patient who was an addict. In 1914, however, Congress passed the Harrison Act to regulate the flow of narcotics. From that time on most physicians, because of their own possible legal jeopardy, refused to supply their addict patients with narcotics. The addicts turned to illicit channels.

During the 1919-24 period, approximately 40 cities had dispensaries and outpatient clinics for the medical treatment of addicts, with narcotics available. Under pressure from the Bureau of Internal Revenue, which enforced the Harrison Act, all of these clinics were eventually closed. More addicts were forced into illegal activities to obtain their drugs.

Through the years the federal government increased the penalties for narcotics violations. Severe penalties were also instituted for the misuse of "dangerous drugs" (amphetamines, barbiturates, psychedelics, etc.). The states built up similar bodies of law.

Here are the present federal penalties for

the sale or possession of narcotics or dangerous drugs:

Narcotics: Possession

1st offense: not less than 2 or more than 10 years in prison; not more than \$20,000 fine. Minimum sentence mandatory, but judge may suspend it.

2nd offense: 5-20 years; \$20,000. No probation, no parole.

3rd offense: 10-40 years; \$20,000. No probation, no parole.

Narcotics: Sale

1st offense: 5-20 years; \$20,000. No probation, no parole (except for marijuana). For a person over 18 who sells a narcotic (including marijuana) to a person under 18, or conspires to do so, the sentence may be 10-40 years; if the drug is heroin, the sentence may be 10 years to life, or, at the jury's discretion, the death penalty.

2nd and subsequent offenses: 10-40 years; \$20,000. No probation, no parole (except for marijuana, after one-third of the sentence has been served).

Dangerous drugs: Sale or possession for sale

1st and subsequent offenses: up to 5 years; up to \$10,000. A person over 18 who sells to a person under 21 may be given up to 10 years and fined up to \$15,000; for a second offense, up to 15 years and \$20,000.

Dangerous drugs: Possession

1st or 2nd offense: 1 year and/or \$1000. On a first conviction, person may be put on probation; if he does well, conviction can be wiped out.

3rd offense: up to 3 years and/or \$10,000.

The federal law regarding the possession of marijuana has undergone a very recent change, as a result of a U.S. Supreme Court decision in a case involving Dr. Timothy Leary. According to Assistant U.S. Attorney John H. Binger, Jr., who provided me with the above information, the Leary decision held in effect that compliance with the federal law could force a person to incriminate himself, a violation of the Fifth Amendment. Binger said that there probably would not be any more federal prosecutions for possession of marijuana until a new statute was written. However, he added, prosecutions for sale of marijuana would probably continue. And, of course, prosecutions for both possession and sale of marijuana will continue at the state and local levels.

Under Pennsylvania law, possession or sale of narcotics is a felony. Penalties for possession range from 2 to 30 years in prison, with fines of from \$2000 to \$7500, depending on the number of the offense. Penalties for sale range from 5 years to life, with fines of from \$5000 to \$30,000. Pennsylvania also has a law against the use of narcotics, with penalties of up to 1 year and/or a fine of up to \$5000 for a first offense, up to 3 years and/or a fine of up to \$25,000 for a second. The same penalties also apply to the possession or sale of dangerous drugs.

THE PROGRAMS

In the early Thirties the U.S. Public Health Service established hospitals for the treatment of narcotics addicts at Lexington, Ky., and Fort Worth, Texas. Addicts were withdrawn from drugs; mental health professionals were available for counseling; vocational and recreational programs were provided.

Nearly 40 years later people are still debating the effectiveness of these hospitals. Dr. Emil S. Trellis, who spent two years at Lexington as head of the Women's Addiction Service, feels that on balance they were not successful. "They made a contribution at a certain point in time," he said in a recent interview. "At Lexington they took in anybody, regardless of race, and they offered shelter and food and a chance to be withdrawn from drugs. But the place was built as a maximum-security prison, and it func-

tioned as a minimum-security prison, until recent years anyway. They couldn't possibly provide more than a fragmented human experience. There was no way for the addicts to take the relationships with them when they went back to their homes. Except for one pilot program in New York City, there was no attempt at follow-up."

In November, 1963, the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotics and Drug Abuse recommended that the two hospitals "accept voluntary patients only for purposes of research study in the future." Today, however, the two hospitals are being used for examination and treatment of addicts under the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966. This act, in the words of a Public Health Service flyer, "represents the view that narcotic addiction is symptomatic of an illness that should be treated and not a criminal circumstance in itself." Under the provisions of NARA, addicts who are charged with certain federal crimes may choose treatment instead of prosecution; or addicts convicted of a federal crime may be sentenced by the court to commitment for treatment; or addicts not charged with a crime may ask to be civilly committed.

The government intends to eventually have all of the services provided under NARA available in local communities throughout the country. In the Pittsburgh area, the government has contracted with the Harmarville Rehabilitation Center for post-hospital care of approximately 20 addicts.

Dr. Trellis is in complete agreement with this community concept. "Why should a person from Pittsburgh have to go to Lexington for treatment?" he asked. "That takes too many communities off the hook."

Turning to other programs, California has one that is about ten years old. The main facility is in a former Naval officers' club located in Corona. Addicts are taken in under civil commitment or in lieu of prison sentences. The program operates under the California Board of Parole. Educational and recreational activities are provided. There are "halfway houses" associated with the program.

Another program which began in California has become perhaps the best-known in the country. It is Synanon, begun in the late Fifties by a group of ex-addicts. Synanon developed the concept of the "therapeutic community"—a "family" of residents working together to take care of each other. Addicts are made to "kick cold"—withdraw abruptly, with no substitute for the drugs they have been using. No medicines are allowed, not even aspirin.

Dr. Trellis believes that the "therapeutic community" concept is an important development. "The people who succeed at Synanon are able to learn motivation and self-discipline," he said. "They are able to live with dignity. They are able to become creative, not just artistically but intellectually, in a variety of ways. They've learned how to interact with other human beings in a very open way, not fearing vulnerability the way they once did."

"Synanon has always been very selective," Trellis said, "taking in only the best-motivated people, through a fairly elaborate intake procedure. A criticism sometimes raised is that they have never released figures on how many people left prematurely, or how many people were able to stay off drugs after they left."

Of the more than 64,000 narcotics addicts presently known to the government, more than half are in New York. It is not surprising that New York has developed a variety of programs to try to deal with the problem.

New York has a civil commitment program, under which addicts are committed to state hospitals surrounding New York City. "This program is not working out well," Trellis said. "One reason may be that in any pro-

gram of this type the responsibility for carrying out the treatment is taken away from a person so committed, and transferred to his doctors and the other authorities."

Another New York program is Daytop Village. This was the first "therapeutic community" program on the East Coast. It was set up by the federal courts, and is run by a former Synanon resident. People from Daytop Village have recently begun going into other communities to see if they can develop similar programs.

In New York in the early Sixties, Drs. Vincent P. Dole and Marie B. Nyswander pioneered what has come to be called "methadone maintenance." Methadone is a synthetic narcotic. Dole and Nyswander found that increasing increments of methadone would not only block heroin craving, but would also block the "high" produced clinically by a grain of pure heroin. (A grain of pure heroin is equal to 3-4 grains of morphine; 3 grains of morphine is 12 times the average therapeutic dose.) In addition to medical treatment, people in this program are given support, job counseling, etc.

Critics have charged that this program is just another form of addiction. Dr. Trellis believes that it is a significant breakthrough. "Certainly a person has a lifelong commitment to methadone, which means at least a limitation to travel," he said. "But equally important is the fact that methadone does not meet the emotional needs we've talked about. Many people on methadone turn to alcohol and other drugs in an attempt to deal with these problems. Sensitivity and control—urine-testing for drugs, for example—are just as important in the treatment as the methadone itself. But when a person is successfully treated with methadone, he is able to function, he is able to live with some peace and dignity."

Another program which Trellis believes has promise is Phoenix House. It was developed in New York over the past few years. It is another "therapeutic community" program, with ex-addicts, storefronts for contacts, etc. It operates under the Addiction Service Agency of New York City, and it is also supported by the Phoenix Foundation. The program has stages, starting with a Phoenix Center, where an addict may have to kick his habit without medical help. From there he goes to a day-care center, then to a Phoenix House, where treatment may last as long as a year. Following that he goes to a "re-entry house," where he begins to work his way back into the community. People may drop out at various stages; currently there are over 700 people in treatment.

Dr. Trellis himself developed and ran for four years a pilot program for treating narcotics addiction, at Torrance State Hospital. Of that program, he said simply: "It was an honorable failure. Some patients are still doing well; others did well for various periods of time. And I think to a certain extent we educated the community—the police, the courts, and so on."

Trellis went on to say: "The biggest mistake I made was in pitying the addicts, in assuming that we—society—had to do things for them, like getting them withdrawn, finding them jobs, etc.—instead of showing them that was their responsibility. Also, unless you have community involvement—which we weren't able to develop—it matters very little what you do in an isolated hospital setting. That's why I consider the 'therapeutic community' model as having the greatest potential for treatment."

In reference to the "therapeutic community" concept, Dr. Trellis said that it was his understanding that Black Muslims have had some success in treating addiction. "It was mentioned in Malcolm X's autobiography," he said. "I also heard about it at Lexington and again here in Pittsburgh. I have had no direct knowledge of it, however."

There are no large-scale treatment pro-

grams operating at present in Pittsburgh, although several small programs using various approaches have been initiated. Elsewhere, several states are developing programs, using, variously, "therapeutic community," "methadone maintenance," or hospital models. It is of course too early to evaluate these programs.

* * * * *

Last February, John E. Ingersoll, director of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, addressed the National Coordinating Council on Drug Abuse Education and Information. According to the New York Times, Ingersoll told the Council members that drug-abuse arrests had increased 774 percent over the past eight years. That was, he said, "a shame and a tragedy." "We are not preventing enough drug abuse; we are not apprehending enough peddlers; we are not rehabilitating enough abusers," he said. In prevention and rehabilitation particularly, he said, "we have failed miserably."

* * * * *

Thus far in this series we have spent a good deal of time on narcotics, specifically on heroin addiction. In terms of its cost to the individual and to society, heroin addiction is the most serious drug problem. And, as we have seen, there are no answers, only beginnings.

Heroin addicts, however, make up only a portion of the drug-using population. There are serious implications for society in all drug use. But are these implications always the same, or do they vary from drug to drug and from person to person?

DRUGS: PART 4—THE ISSUE IS HUMAN MISERY (By Richard Rieker)

Suppose we have come to see that "drug use" in its broadest sense—including, for example, alcohol—is all but universal in our society. And suppose we accept the term "drug use" as implying anything from occasional use to physiological or psychological dependence to, finally, addiction. And suppose we recognize that every single case of drug use involves complex psychological and socio-economic factors. The big question remains: what can we do about it?

For this final article I put a series of questions to Dr. Emil S. Trellis.

First of all, what is your attitude toward drug use in general?

I don't think it can be said that everyone who uses a drug is "sick," anymore than it can be said that anytime any of us does any one thing in a self-defeating way it indicates emotional illness. I think more important is, what is the frequency, the pattern, the specific nature of the self-defeating behavior? Also, what does this behavior mean in the context of the person's life style?

What's the first thing you do when you're consulted about a person who is using drugs?

I find out what the drug is. The implications are different for each drug. Heroin implies potential addiction; it also implies many years' commitment to a way of life totally centered around getting the drug. Everybody who shoots heroin doesn't become an addict, but the potential is always there. It's there for any narcotic. The doctor or nurse who uses narcotics—self-medicates—may be in for the same thing—a way of life, a little more graceful but just as fixed.

Barbiturates might imply the total spectrum which we talked about, from intermittent use, with whatever "comfort" a person gets, through physiologic addiction, to death from an overdose alone or in combination with alcohol.

Amphetamines could mean anything from the occasional "high" to "speeding"—going for days at an exhilarated rate, with little food or sleep—to the tremendous depression which many people fear when they discontinue the drug. In short, the whole gamut of things we discussed before.

Psychedelics can mean a "good time" or a

very bad one, with all the consequences we talked about. To me the so-called "good trip" carries all the potential for a bad one at some future time.

I don't know what all the implications of marijuana are. There's a legal risk, and one certainly has to ask why a person is willing to run that risk.

As for glue and cough medicine and the like, what they imply to me is a person who for some reason is looking to be "high" much of the time. I don't think the substance is that important; what's important is what it means. A ten-year-old child sniffing glue is addiction-prone; a young adult who drives all over the county picking up bottles of cough medicine may well "graduate" to something else.

What else do you look for? What about the age of the person?

Age is important because the younger the person is—with the exception of heroin-users—the more the drug use can be thought of as a part of adolescence, and the more hope I might have for the person.

Why the exception for heroin-users?

It's my feeling that, with some exceptions, the heroin-user is so psychologically ill before he starts using heroin that he almost has to hurt himself very badly before he can consider stopping.

What if the person is beyond adolescence?

Again the implications vary. If a person in his late twenties or early thirties starts using drugs, for example, at a time when he should be in the prime of his life, I ask myself, why is he doing what the young people are doing, why doesn't he have something better going for himself?

What else?

I try to find out what the person's doing with his life in general—does he have a job, is he in school, does he have something that brings him some kind of gratification? Then I might ask, what kind of family does he have—who cares about him, and for him? And how much does he have to "pay" them for their caring? Sometimes it's very costly to be loved. Sometimes through any form of social deviance you're acting out the unconscious wishes of those who love you. Some sociologists feel that any deviant person acts out for the society at large. And certainly one effect is that it allows the rest of us to feel "holier than thou," or, if you prefer, "healthier than thou."

I'd probably ask the person how he sees himself in the context of drug use. The "seeing himself" is what's important. If he truly sees himself as having no problems, I feel that very little can be done, other than going through certain ritualistic motions—Lexington, psychiatric care, threatening to put him in jail, and so on—all of which haven't demonstrated very much.

Do you write that person off them?

I don't think we should write anybody off. But for practical purposes we haven't yet found institutional forces to deal effectively with people like this. There are certain exceptions—in our own community, for example, I know two particularly sensitive men who happen to be clergymen, who have had success in difficult one-to-one relationships. That gives a modicum of hope. But these people are usually so overworked, and so misunderstood by the community at large, as well as by the churches they represent—and hence so undersupported—that they find it hard to work out programs.

We've been talking so far as if all drug users were men. The latest figures on narcotics addiction show that about 15 per cent of those listed are women. Are there additional implications in drug use by women?

The obvious one is pregnancy. If a woman should become pregnant, either because she's prostituting to support her habit, or out of a general self-destructiveness, there are serious consequences for her and for society—the unwanted baby, the psychological con-

sequences of adoption or therapeutic abortion, the physical and psychological consequences of criminal abortion, and so on.

Let's turn to race. I know you draw major implications from the correlation between race and the use of certain drugs.

It's true that I choose to emphasize that heroin use predominates in black, Puerto Rican, or "Mexican" ghettos, as part of the ghetto syndrome. Which, by the way, is seen by some people in the ghetto as "beating the Man." I recognize that that's an obvious over-simplification. In our society there are whites from a variety of socio-economic backgrounds—Squirrel Hill, Shadyside, Brookline, Morningside, Larimer Avenue—who are using heroin. But heroin is not endemic to those communities. And the expectation of white people for white people is certainly much different from that of white people for black people. This is racism. The expectation or lack of expectation of the culture at large is a factor in what is acted out as social deviance. In this connection, I personally feel that a kid from Squirrel Hill who sticks a needle in his arm has to be much sicker than his counterpart in the black community. Whether that's a fit subject for research or a subtle expression of my own racism is hard to say.

Yet, when you say the white kid is "sicker" aren't you yourself coming dangerously close to racism, either the white or black kind?

I see the danger but I don't think that's what I'm doing. What I'm stressing is this enormous differential in expectation. What I'm saying, in effect, is that it's sicker for a white kid to go against society's expectation than for a black kid to live up to it.

It's this difference in expectation that I believe is at the center of all the concern today about drugs. As I've said before, we're now being confronted with the fact that "our children" are using a whole variety of drugs, and in our confusion and hysteria we're acting as if they were all using heroin—which we previously never cared about. We've suddenly discovered that the narcotics law includes marijuana. We're asking for treatment programs and the only models we have are for treating heroin addiction—or the private practice of psychiatry. In our frenzy to prevent drug use—as if that were the only issue—we're offering courses on drugs to children and parents. But all along we had in our society a significant number of people addicted to heroin, and we didn't care. It's ironic, but the fact of our having cared so little for those groups inclined to use heroin, may be part of the illness in our society to which our children are reacting, in part through their own use of drugs.

Let's look at what has been done to try to control drug abuse. Take the law: do you have any recommendations?

Philosophically, one has to consider the intent of the law. It would seem to me that the laws concerning narcotics are intended to remove people from society, and to punish them. In the absence of effective treatment programs, this may be in fact what society really wants to do.

Specifically, I do think that the minimum mandatory five-year sentence for the sale of narcotics, with the no probation-no parole provision, should be revised. In the first place, if incarceration is to have any redeeming value to the person, the possibility of parole should exist so that the person is motivated to get what positive things he can from the institution, rather than finding negative ways to adapt to it. And secondly, though the intent of the law was to remove the "pusher" from circulation, the "pusher" in most cases turns out to be a little man in the business who is addicted himself; it's seldom the people with key "executive" positions who get caught.

As for marijuana, I think that since it's not pharmacologically a narcotic, its legal position should be reconsidered.

How do you feel about legalizing narcotics?

That question is often raised in reference to the so-called "British system." England, today, does not have a problem of the magnitude of ours, not because their "system" is so good, but because they never made addiction a criminal matter—instead they allowed it to be an illness calling for medical treatment. But today the authorities in England are very concerned about the growing use of heroin, cocaine, and other substances. As a result they're imposing many restrictions on the medical model which they've been using. They're also studying what is being done in this country to see what they might adopt. In other words, there is no "British system"—they merely have not forced addicts to become criminals. The closest I would come to advocating legalized narcotics at this moment in time would be to support honest, well-controlled methadone maintenance programs.

Let's go on to the area of treatment. Last week we looked at some programs for treating narcotics addicts. What are your views on those, as well as on treatment in general?

For heroin addiction, I feel that the therapeutic community and methadone maintenance concepts ought to be strongly supported, with on-going evaluation, particularly of methadone maintenance. There are two other current concepts which I think should be re-examined very carefully. One is civil commitment, the other is the availability of withdrawal beds. For the first, if society wants to get addicts off the streets, civil commitment has merit; but New York and California experiences indicate that for most addicts this is not a very effective treatment method.

The same can be said for the idea of making withdrawal beds available. Many addicts in the street will say, if they could only kick their habit and get a job they would be fine. But it has been demonstrated over and over that physiological withdrawal is the easiest aspect of treatment to achieve, and in itself has very little value beyond the temporary comfort of the addict, and the fact that while he's lying in bed he's not shoplifting. Withdrawal beds are the easiest things for legislators to provide. I'm not opposed to withdrawal beds as such; I just wish people wouldn't kid themselves that they provide any kind of significant treatment.

For people not using narcotics, varying approaches can be considered, depending on the clinical circumstances. In some cases psychiatric hospitalization may be necessary. For others, psychotherapy or counseling might be helpful. For the majority, however, I'm afraid that these are neither indicated nor of significant value.

I think we have to find new ways of working with young people, in groups, where they themselves do the grouping. This requires a great deal of flexibility on the part of the treatment staff. The staff, by the way, can be anyone related to the mental health professions, or for that matter can be any interested, sensitive person with appropriate training and sufficient psychiatric support when needed. This group approach also requires a lot of interpretation to funding sources, to advisory boards, and to the community at large, so that the people working with the kids won't be held personally responsible for any self-destructive act committed by any kid in the program—which could happen at any hour, day or night.

You seem to be implying that there will be a lot of self-destructive acts.

There well may be; these kids are hurting themselves right now. The point I've been trying to make throughout this series is that we must not look at drug use alone, we must look at all the things that young people are into. What society seems to want is some service-for-a-fee which will make all these things go away—and in my opinion that's just not possible today. That's why it's so important to support those people who are

working well with the kids, so that their energy can be directed to the kids and not dissipated in trying to justify everything that's being done.

You jumped from narcotics addicts to young people. What about people in their thirties or forties who are using drugs other than narcotics?

Where possible we ought to use the conventional approaches—psychotherapy, counseling, and so on. But unless some unusual person with a great deal of energy wants to innovate, I don't think there's much that can be done today for this group; and there certainly isn't much financial support available.

Are you saying that in some circumstances a lay person might be more effective than professionals, including psychiatrists?

Yes. This has been demonstrated in the therapeutic communities. The important issue is that the people involved in treatment, in the broadest sense of that word, be psychologically sound themselves. That implies that they'll have the kind of honesty to report factually what happens, and that they won't use the drug-users as a means of meeting their own emotional needs.

I guess the only major concept we haven't discussed is prevention. I assume that the best way to deal with drug abuse is to prevent it. Does anybody know how?

I certainly don't have any specific program for doing it. If I had, I would have announced it long before this.

I do think that all of us could begin to think about new ways of using existing institutions to attack the problem. For example, schools at all levels have a captive audience for x-number of days out of the year. Dare we begin to take time from studies to let children talk about whatever children want to talk about? Do we have the time to let a first-grader talk about what it means to him when his mother comes home from the hospital with a new baby with whom he has to compete? Can we let a child in the third or fourth grade talk about loss—a game, a test—even a parent? Dare we let kids really talk about sexuality, at any level, apart from "sex education"?

We can't do these things now because, aside from the notion that we "don't have the time," we aren't willing to pay for the kind of person called "teacher" who is capable of handling them. But if we did do these things, we might be able to prevent some of what we're trying to treat today. I think we'd also be able to see emerging mental illness in some children. Then, of course, we'd have to have the facilities for treating that.

To go on with schools for a moment—could schools become relevant for parents, other than as barometers of their own self-esteem regarding their children's grades? Could we use the schools as a place for conducting workshops for parents, dealing with subjects that affect both their children and themselves? Suppose instead of a "talk about drugs," the parents had a ten-week seminar on adolescence, where they met in small groups with an appropriate leader. For some this might reinforce the positive aspects of the parent-child relationship; for others it might provide some insight into the negative aspects. In the process, a few parents might experience such emotional stress that they'd become significantly distraught. The experience wouldn't have made them sick, it would have brought into the open areas of conflict which up to then had been dormant. Again, we would have to have sufficient clinical resources available to meet such problems.

Are you talking about "encounter groups"?

Not necessarily. My feeling is that true encounter groups should be limited to those who have been somewhat screened, so that people won't be unnecessarily hurt; or should be part of a program which can meet the needs of those who are hurt.

What other institutions would you use besides the schools?

Dare we reconsider the purpose of religious institutions? Should organized religion in the twentieth century do no more than address itself to the spiritual needs of its congregations, in return for the financial support of those congregations? Here again, in a somewhat captive audience assembled with the hope of going to heaven, dare we try to bring heaven down to earth?

I think that formal religious institutions ought to think about programs at every age level which would consider the emotional needs of their members. This doesn't necessarily require in-depth group psychotherapy; discussion groups at a conscious level might be effective. Whatever the vehicle, the issues of people living together ought to be explored.

I could go on listing other institutions, but I think the point is clear: we have got to find ways of meeting the emotional needs of people before they become ill. If we can do that, I think we have a chance of preventing drug abuse, as well as some of the other symptoms of emotional illness. Because, as I've said over and over, drug abuse is not an isolated phenomenon. And it can't be prevented the way polio once was, with three sugar cubes. The question is not how do we prevent drug abuse; the question is how do we prevent human misery.

Postscript: As we were concluding this series President Nixon sent to Congress a new ten-point program for dealing with drug abuse. (New York Times, 7/15/69) The legislative package includes, among other things, stiffer penalties for violations involving LSD; authority for federal agents to break into homes unannounced to look for evidence; new measures to control importation and distribution of illegal drugs; and new programs in education, research, and rehabilitation. I asked Dr. Trellis to comment on the President's program.

It's obvious that the people who advise the President have a point of view very different from mine. Their emphasis is largely on laws to control and punish. When they get into education, they evidently feel that "bringing the facts to every American" will meet people's emotional needs. In the section on rehabilitation, Mr. Nixon says that "Society has an obligation both to itself and to these people to help them break the chains of their dependency." It would seem to me that American citizens who are black or Puerto Rican or Mexican-American need a few additional chains broken.

In short, it's sad that a collection of clichés is being used in a highly simplistic way to try to meet a series of highly complex problems. But maybe at this stage of our national awareness, with the multitude of problems facing us, Mr. Nixon is providing what most Americans want.

TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCEMENT

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 1969

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to rise in support of the supersonic transport.

To those of us who have followed the growth of aviation, the SST is an exciting prospect both from the standpoint of passenger service and advancing technology.

There is no doubt but that the SST

will be built. The question is when and by whom, I think President Nixon read the pioneering spirit of America correctly when he announced that this country would meet the challenges of technology, competition and market success.

This plane, which will fly at nearly 1,800 miles per hour, will mean that by 1978, when it will fly commercially, Tokyo will be as close to Washington, D.C., in terms of hours as London is today.

We cannot delay that date and that achievement by putting off our commitment. There is too much to lose in terms of technological leadership.

I think it should be pointed out that the sooner we can get that plane in the air, the sooner we can begin realizing a return on our investment.

The SST is a sound program, comprehensively planned and programed for both technological and financial success. Thousands of man-hours have gone into its design and production. We cannot allow that effort to go down the drain.

WORLD FOOD AND POPULATION CRISIS

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw my colleagues' attention to an article entitled "Food and Population—the Noncrisis Crisis," by Mr. Paul G. Hoffman. This article appeared in the July issue of the *War on Hunger*, monthly publication of the Agency for International Development of which Dr. John A. Hannah, former president of the University of Michigan, is the Administrator.

Paul Hoffman's name is, of course, familiar to all those who have an interest in the economic and social growth of the underdeveloped regions of the world. Although he is probably best recalled as the first administrator of the Marshall plan, he has subsequently served as president of the Ford Foundation. Since 1959 he has headed the development program of the United Nations. His has clearly been a long and distinguished career of service to mankind.

I was most impressed by the dynamic challenges laid down in this article. Mr. Hoffman makes it quite clear that a major food-population crisis is rapidly developing; if not already upon us. He also explains why we cannot deal with this problem solely in crisis terms; for to do so would only postpone the day of reckoning. Instead, he calls for a program of total development of the complete potential of the low-income countries. Although the time for doing what must be accomplished, if hunger is to be eradicated and birth rates to decline, is extremely short, Mr. Hoffman is optimistic on the chances of success.

Certainly this is a subject of deep and growing concern to all Members of Congress and to the general public. I recommend it to your reading, as follows:

FOOD AND POPULATION—THE NONCRISIS CRISIS

(By Paul G. Hoffman)

(NOTE.—The United Nations Development Program is one of the major forces in the War on Hunger. As a member of the U.N., through the Agency for International Development, the United States proposed to increase its contribution to the UNDP in Fiscal Year 1970 to \$100 million, compared to \$70.3 million in Fiscal Year 1969. The total pledged by all nations in 1969 is an estimated \$196 million.)

Amid the welter of facts and assumptions characterizing the food-population problem, three things at least seem clear. First, a crisis of major proportions is certainly shaping up, if it is not already upon us. Second, we can't afford to think of or deal with this situation solely in crisis terms for to do so will only postpone the day of reckoning and not avert it. Third, the food-population problem can be resolved because new technologies—some already perfected and others within our grasp—make it possible for us to do so.

We know, to our sorrow, that hundreds of millions of people throughout Asia, Africa, Latin America and the Middle East rarely, if ever, get enough nourishing food to eat; and that, while few may be literally starving, a great many are dying prematurely from the effects of chronic malnutrition. This is an appalling human tragedy.

We also know that the tragedy threatens to deepen, because the number of mouths to be fed in these areas of deprivation is increasing by perhaps 55 to 60 million every year. We know, finally, that no part of the earth can hope to remain untouched by the political instability, social unrest and economic dislocation which the food-population imbalance in the developing countries is bound to cause. Herein lies the "crisis" aspect of the situation.

Beyond doubt, there is urgent need for intensified action on both the food production and family planning fronts. As regards the first of these areas a great deal has already been accomplished by the development of high-yield cereals. In a number of countries, millions of acres have been converted from low-yield to high-yield varieties of rice, wheat and corn with a consequent doubling of output per acre. However, much remains to be done. For example, only a small start has been made toward enriching the nutritional value of rice, wheat, corn and other nonmeat foodstuffs which make up so large a part of the average man's diet in the low-income countries.

Containing the population explosion is a more difficult matter, since effective birth planning measures require a long lead time before showing appreciable results. Nevertheless, far swifter progress is possible in this field than has as yet been achieved.

But intensified basic agricultural research and expanded action to foster family planning, essential though they are, will not provide the total answer to the food-population problem. What is necessary, rather, is a many-faceted, closely integrated attack—pressed home with urgency but also with due deliberation and great perseverance.

THE NEED FOR "TOTAL" DEVELOPMENT

The United Nations Development Program, in close collaboration with 16 international agencies and in cooperation with more than a score of bilateral programs (including, of course, that of the Agency for International Development), is supporting the efforts of over 120 low-income countries to solve the food-population problem. The rationale which underlies UNDP activities, and which has evolved over many years of practical field experience, may be briefly summed up as follows.

We are convinced that the food-population imbalance in the low-income countries is part of the overall development problem those

countries face and cannot successfully be dealt with in isolation. It can, in fact, only be corrected when the entire economic, social and cultural climate in a given area becomes favorable to this process.

This is not surprising when we consider how complex and closely interlocking are the many elements involved.

There is a somberly curious fact about the food-population problem—the fact that its causes and effects are so closely entwined with each other as to form an unusually vicious circle. To be specific, the combination of malfunctioning agricultural systems and excessive population growth tends to create conditions that keep food production down and birth rates up. Thus, the problem is perpetuated by its own consequences.

The myriad of impediments to economic growth, which both stem from and result in a low level of agricultural production, also contribute to the population problem. Although the mechanism is still not fully understood, there seems to be a definite relationship between widespread poverty and high birth rates. Where one exists, you almost always find the other. But when living standards rise, birth rates generally go down and, indeed, there is some evidence to show that the former is *essential* to the latter.

SOME EXTRAORDINARY STUBBORN PROBLEMS

Beyond these complexities of cause and effect, there are certain other conditions prevalent throughout the underdeveloped parts of the world which have thus far made the food-population imbalance hard to rectify.

One of these is that, until quite recently, much of the land area in the low-income countries was literally *terra incognita*—with potentially fertile areas unsurveyed, soil conditions untested, water resources of all kinds unexplored, and fertilizer and irrigation needs largely unevaluated. Another limiting circumstance has been, and remains, the shortage of agricultural technicians, of rural extension workers, and even of ordinary farmers literate enough to read a simple instructional pamphlet.

Outdated and inefficient land tenure systems played and still play an adverse role. So, too, does the fact that in many developing areas there is little economic incentive for the average farmer to produce more than his own family needs for subsistence. The depredations of insects, rodents and birds on growing crops—as well as the spoilage of foodstuffs in transit or in warehouses—also make drastic inroads on available supplies.

This listing does not exhaust the roster of problems which spark the food-population crisis and fuel its continuation. What it does is to demonstrate the complexity of that crisis, its huge dimensions, and the inadequacy of an emergency-oriented, fire-fighting approach.

Nevertheless, despite past discouragements and present dangers, I am convinced that the threat of widespread famine in the world's low-income countries need never materialize. Beyond this I am equally convinced that these countries can within the foreseeable future make the kind of overall development progress which would, among much else, largely banish hunger, malnutrition and all their attendant miseries from the global scene. That will be by no means an easy task. But it is by no means an impossible one.

PREINVESTMENT AND PRODUCTIVITY

One reason I feel such confidence is the accumulation of evidence that poverty in the low-income nations—including their agricultural underdevelopment—does not stem from any lack of natural or human resources but from a great under-utilization of those resources. In fact, according to generally accepted estimates, the low-income countries are currently able to employ only about 20 percent of their natural resource potentials

and about 10 percent of their human productive capabilities.

Another reason for optimism is that during the past decade the majority of the developing lands have successfully laid the groundwork for altering this ratio and for converting their latent wealth into productive wealth-in-being. It should be emphasized that this vital but often "hidden" progress has very largely achieved through the efforts of low-income countries themselves, for they have borne and are bearing the major share of the costs. But it must equally be realized that external development aid has been, and will continue to be, a vital supplementary factor.

As the world's largest channel for multilateral preinvestment and technical assistance to the low-income countries, the United Nations Development Program is an active force on virtually every sector of the drive for economic growth. It helps governments representing more than 1.5 billion people to survey, assess, and make fuller use of their untapped natural resources.

These preinvestment projects have a twofold aim. The first is to create favorable conditions for mobilizing development capital on a sound and businesslike basis from both domestic and external sources. The second is to prepare the way for fully effective use of such capital and of all other available economic and human assets.

ACCENT ON AGRICULTURE

During the last ten years, the UNDP has supported many hundreds of large and smaller-scale agricultural projects with a total cost of over \$950 million—more than half of which was met by the developing countries themselves. This figure represents roughly 33 percent of total program commitments.

A wide range of activities is involved. They include integrated rural development, land and water use, forestry, fishing, plant production and protection, animal production and health, food processing and marketing, and adult literacy training for farm families. Though several members of the U.N. agency family have collaborated in carrying out such UNDP-supported projects, the bulk of the responsibility has, of course, been entrusted to the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO).

Space allows only the barest sampling of the agricultural development work undertaken by the UNDP, its participating agencies and low-income countries in every part of the world. But a very brief sketch of two major projects will give at least some impression of the Program's activities in this field.

In 1962, the UNDP joined with the government of Upper Volta and FAO to found an Agricultural Training Center at Bobo-Dioulasso. This project, which has recently been expanded in scope and extended for an additional five years, serves as the nucleus of a coordinated rural development effort. The Center conducts advanced courses for agricultural specialists, accelerated training for lower-level technicians, refresher studies for government personnel and "on-the-job" training for the area's leading farmers. A demonstration farm has been set up to produce improved seeds and animal breeding stock for local use. Families living in a small model village established by the project have tripled their incomes and doubled their corn harvests.

Fifteen to 20 similar communities are now being planned and these, in turn, will become prototypes for a nation-wide program. Future activities will also include formation of an Agricultural Extension Section to help raise farm output and rural living standards . . . the inauguration of radio broadcasts with associated "listener-discussion" groups . . . and the establishment of a Regional Development Organization to work with local co-

operatives in providing credit, marketing, health, sanitation and other vital services.

AN ALL-AROUND ATTACK

A survey assisted by the UNDP and FAO has drawn up detailed \$79 million investment plans for forestry and mixed farming development in northeastern Nicaragua. The study disclosed that this region has the capacity for meeting most of the country's food-grain requirements, for doubling the present size of its cattle herds, and for significantly increasing fish catches. Proper exploitation of these potentials would free land in the West for expanded production of export crops. Of even greater importance, the project revealed that forestry development in the area would annually yield some 600,000 tons of unbleached pine fibers with a sales value exceeding \$70 million dollars.

The UNDP—working with the United Nations Office of Technical Cooperation, ILO, UNESCO, the World Bank, WHO and other participating agencies—is also involved in a broad spectrum of non-agricultural activities which are intimately related to solving the food population problem.

Among these are projects for industrial expansion, for the improvement of public utilities and services, for equipping large numbers of men and women with many kinds of essential skills, for raising health and social welfare standards and, of course, for extending voluntary birth control measures. In this latter field, our work has largely been confined thus far to helping governments carry out demographic and other population studies. But we hope, indeed we expect, that we will shortly be called on to play a much greater part in meeting this absolutely critical challenge.

Not only in its agricultural efforts, but all across the board, the UNDP has received very generous support from the United States. The United States has provided valuable guidance for our work through its membership in our Governing Council. It has voluntarily contributed nearly \$800 million to our central resources. Beyond this it has furnished direct supplementary aid to scores of projects all over the world.

WHAT NEXT IN THE WAR ON HUNGER

Mr. A. H. Boerma, Director-General of FAO, has expressed the view that the idea of a race between food production and population growth is an oversimplification. He feels that an effective response to the food-population crisis in the developing countries requires an overall attack on the basic problems of poverty. I think as I have tried to show, that this goes to the heart of the matter.

Clearly, much must be done in the agricultural field alone. Here there are certain key areas which deserve a high priority. To list but a few, intensive work must be done on the development of cereal and vegetable strains with a high protein content. Systematic efforts must be made to harvest rather than simply "hunt" the seas. More research must be carried out on inexpensive and safe pesticides and on improved, more readily available fertilizers. There must be greater efforts to introduce and win acceptance of modern farming techniques so that the full potentials of the "green revolution" can be realized. Perhaps above all, there must be increased emphasis on integrated rural development.

Still we should think in broader terms than these. For the wise physician treats more than the ailment, he treats the whole person. If we are to cure the critical ailment of food-population imbalance which afflicts two-thirds of mankind and threatens all the rest, we must take a similar approach.

We must work for the total development of all the vast productive potentials which the low-income countries possess. And we must seek to integrate that development with simultaneous progress toward a unified global economy.

AUSTRALIA BUYS F-111

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, Prime Minister Gorton has informed the Australian Legislature and the people of Australia of his decision to acquire the F-111 aircraft, according to news reports.

Among other things, the Prime Minister stated:

For this purpose it is the best aircraft in the world, and our military advisers after evaluating other possible aircraft types tell us that there is not in being or in prospect any aircraft that would approach the already demonstrated performance of the F-111 as a Strike aircraft of the kind the RAAF requires.

This expression is shared by many of us who have felt all along that the F-111 is the finest aircraft of its type in the world, and the only aircraft that can do many of the essential jobs of a true strike aircraft.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the news report from Canberra, which follows:

The Prime Minister made the following statement to the House this evening.

This House will know that the government recently sent a high-level mission to the United States to discuss matters concerning F-111 aircraft.

That mission has now submitted its report to the government and the government has considered it.

However, before detailing the matters discussed and the conclusions reached, there is one matter which I believe should be made clear.

Because of the great publicity which has been given to any accident in which any F-111 aircraft has been involved there has grown up a feeling that the aircraft itself is unsafe.

The record shows that this belief is simply not true.

The United States Air Force fleet of F-111 aircraft have now been flying for a total of more than 40,000 hours, including more than 25,000 hours in the operational command, and now has an accident record better, for example, than the super Sabre or the Phantom and better than any other F century series of aircraft.

On the record, the aircraft is not unsafe and this should be known.

The matters discussed by the mission related to the aircraft's range, its weapons load, the assurance of a continuing supply of spare parts during its service life, and the fatigue performance of the wing carry through box.

Our military advisers are completely satisfied that the range and weapons load of the aircraft will meet the requirements of the Air Force, as set down when the decision to order the aircraft was made.

It will do the job which the Air Force wanted an aircraft to do.

They are also completely satisfied that there will continue to be a full availability of spares, readily available, during the full period of service of the aircraft with the R.A.A.F.

Furthermore, our advice is that the F-111, both in practice and during operations, has demonstrated a capacity to deliver a bomb load in any weather condition with unprece-

ented accuracy, whether the target can be seen or not.

For this purpose it is the best aircraft in the world, and our military advisers after evaluating other possible aircraft types tell us that there is not in being or in prospect any aircraft that would approach the already demonstrated performance of the F-111 as a strike aircraft of the kind the RAAF requires.

The Government believes that the RAAF must have an ultra modern bomber strike aircraft to replace the Canberras which are now the RAAF's only strike force.

The Government knows that the Canberras are approaching the limit of their service life.

And the considerations which I have set out above all point to the F-111 as the best aircraft to be this replacement, without exception.

But there remains the problem of the fatigue performance of the wing carry through box.

This has been a matter of concern to us because it indicates that we would not get the length of service from the aircraft which we require, or anything approaching it.

And our concern has been shared by USAF, although the United States already has over 120 F-111 aircraft operating with the present wing box.

As a result of this concern two matters are in progress.

Firstly the wing box which gave an insufficiently long life under test has been modified as a result of information gained and is to begin a new series at fatigue tests next month.

Secondly more far-reaching activity has been undertaken to overcome the fatigue problems identified as limiting the service life of the aircraft.

Action taken has been comprehensive and has included the participation of groups of technical experts from universities, industry and government all participating in detailed reviews of the test results and proposed actions to resolve those technical problems.

These groups have been assisted by Australian structural experts.

As a result of these investigations, a new design of the wing carry through box is under way and it is intended that this new design will be fitted to F-111 aircraft by 1972.

But, of course, the new design box—which our mission has advised us it confidently expects to be successful—has not yet been in practice.

The question posed now is whether we should accept our F-111s with the modified wing box which is due to begin testing next month.

If we do it is expected that this box will give our F-111s a longer service life than the present wing box but not the length of service life we require.

Modifications seen to be required would be made to the wing boxes already fitted to our aircraft without additional charge to the RAAF.

The Government has decided that, provided the modified wing box to be tested next month lives up to expectations, we should accept the aircraft.

This, however, is conditional on an agreement which has been reached that whatever is needed to finally overcome the wing box problem will be incorporated in our aircraft at the appropriate time and at no increase to the ceiling price under the formula applicable to the purchase of our aircraft.

That is to say that unless the modified wing box we now propose to accept meets the endurance requirements for which it is designed, the USAF will replace it with the new design box to be available in 1972—again with no increase to the ceiling price under the formula applicable to the purchase of our aircraft.

A further safeguard is the agreement that

should one or more of the wing boxes we now propose to accept become unserviceable due to a design deficiency before the new design box is ready for fitting, then the United States will replace those boxes at no cost to us—and as often as may be necessary until the new wing box is available for fitting.

As a result of these agreements we have therefore decided to accept delivery of our F-111's as soon as the fatigue tests beginning next month have proved successful.

We believe that in so doing we will be greatly strengthening the defence capacity of Australia—and that the remaining problems of the aircraft which is not one of safety but of service life—will have been overcome by the arrangements to fit new boxes—or replacement boxes until the new boxes are ready.

I believe I should, in this statement, remind members that the arrangement made with the USAF for those aircraft was that the ceiling cost was to be dollars 5.95 million plus escalation of labour costs and materials after 1965, modification requested by the RAAF, and improvement, modification proposed by the USAF and accepted by the RAAF.

The combined effect of this item will approximate dollars 1.5 million per aircraft.

I would also add that the USAF has decided to go to a RF-111A version for the reconnaissance aircraft and that this decision now makes it possible for the RAAF to proceed to a reconnaissance version of the F-111C as originally contemplated, which will be common with the reconnaissance aircraft in the USAF inventory.

Before the government makes a decision on this matter the government would require far more information as to cost.

Sir, I hope the House and the country will agree that our Air Force needs a strike bomber most effective in operations.

I hope they will accept the advice of our military experts that the F-111 is far and away the best such bomber available.

And I believe they will agree our acceptance of the bomber, subject to the conditions I have set out, will be a powerful addition to our capacity to defend ourselves in need.

INCREASE SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to note that, pursuant to the request of 132 Members of the House of Representatives Democratic caucus, the chairman of the Democratic caucus has today called for a special caucus on October 7, 1969, at 10:30 a.m.

The purpose of this special meeting is to consider a resolution relating to enactment of meaningful across-the-board increases in the social security benefits of not less than 15 percent.

The complete resolution which will be considered is as follows:

Whereas, the inflationary impact which continues without restraint is a critical burden on the elderly on retirement; and

Whereas, the cost of living has skyrocketed since the last Social Security benefit increase and further increases in the cost of living this year will continue to widen the gap between Social Security benefits and the cost of living; and

Whereas, the ten percent increase in

Social Security benefits proposed by the Administration effective April 1, 1970 is too little and too late; and

Whereas, the increase in Social Security benefits should not be deferred until the Administration prepares its broad-scale welfare program;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Democratic Caucus of the House of Representatives of the 91st Congress

That it is the sense of this Caucus that meaningful across-the-board increases in Social Security benefits of not less than 15 percent should be enacted this year;

That the Ways and Means Committee expedite a meaningful increase in Social Security benefits, if the Committee, as a result of its study, reaches the same conclusion;

That this decision should not be delayed by other legislative consideration.

I am also delighted to note the statements in support of this position for immediate 15-percent across-the-board increases in social security benefits by the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, Speaker of the House, the Honorable CARL ALBERT, majority leader, and the Honorable GERALD FORD, minority leader.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation will be enacted before the end of the year. Our responsibility to the senior citizens of America requires immediate action.

TRADE WITH THE ENEMY CONTINUES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the decent, hard-working American citizens remain flabbergasted as to why their country continues to trade with Red countries, consequently strengthening their enemy.

Some have even questioned, if our national policy is to trade with these Bolsheviks, why no arrangements have been made for the release of our military prisoners of war held captive by the Red puppets—North Vietnam, North Korea, and Red China.

I include the Herald of Freedom for September 5, 1969, several news clippings, and the Washington Intelligence Report for June 1969:

[From the Herald of Freedom, Sept. 5, 1969]

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY

Over the years, since Soviet Russia ceased being "our noble ally" at the close of World War II, the Communists have been the enemy of the United States and all the free nations of the world. This has been the period of the Cold War in which the United States has been "fighting" Communism with policies of "containment," giving way to "bridge-building," in what has been termed by President Nixon as an "era of confrontation." He has stated he wishes to end this era and begin an "era of negotiation."

The U.S. President is not moving fast enough, however, to please the Soviets and an article in "Za Rubezhom" (Abroad), a Soviet foreign affairs weekly, recently complained that the Nixon Administration is doing little to reduce world tensions. Commenting upon Mr. Nixon's call for an "era of negotiation," the article stated:

"One cannot say that the Republican Ad-

ministration has publicly refused to fulfill this pledge. But at the same time one cannot help but notice one absolutely clear trend in both the domestic and foreign policies of Washington—a trend toward speeding up the arms race, accompanied by talk about the necessity to preserve and even increase a position of strength in relations with the Soviet Union. Washington has done little in practice to reduce the tension in the world . . .

"If the current leadership of the United States really wants to open a new era in the history of international relations, it must substitute talk about its love for peace with concrete deeds that could strengthen peace and cooperation."

The Soviet Union is well known for its desire for "peaceful coexistence" but, as is not so well known, that happy state can only come when the International Communist Conspiracy has succeeded in its plans for control of the whole world. The Soviet leaders do not wish to co-exist with the free world except on their own terms and the American leaders do not wish to "fight Communism." Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture in the Eisenhower Administration, asks in his book, "An Enemy Hath Done This," a question that should trouble all Americans:

"If we really mean to oppose communist aggression, why did we pick distant Vietnam instead of Cuba? We had the Monroe Doctrine before there ever was a U.N. or a SEATO. If our government leaders are really opposed to communism, why don't they start cleaning them out at home?"

A Communist regime exists and thrives ninety miles from our shores. It began in the Republican Eisenhower Administration with the aid of certain persons in the State Department, the C.I.A. and the NEW YORK TIMES. Cuban patriots were defeated, captured and killed in an invasion attempt at the Bay of Pigs in a planned "failure" arranged by the Kennedy Administration. The Kennedy Administration also guaranteed the safety of the Cuban Communist government from U.S. based Cuban anti-Castro forces in secret agreements at the time of the "Cuban Confrontation." This was presented to the gullible American public as a great "victory" for John F. Kennedy in an "eyeball-to-eyeball" confrontation with Khrushchev over the Soviet missile build-up in Cuba. Some covered cigar-shaped objects were removed from Cuba and these were supposedly the missiles being shipped back to Russia, giving Kennedy his "victory" to bolster Democratic candidates on election eve.

The Johnson Administration continued the Kennedy policy of not allowing Communist Cuba to be bothered by its exiled patriots and the Nixon Administration is following suit. Paul Scott in his syndicated column has stated:

"The Johnson policy of barring anti-Castro refugees from using the U.S. as a base from which to operate against Cuba is being strictly enforced by the Nixon Administration."

"Immigration, Custom, and Coast Guard authorities have orders from the White House to seize and arrest any persons violating this policy which has crippled efforts of Cuban refugees to overthrow Castro."

"So tight is this American protection ring around Cuba that anti-Castro refugee leaders are now being stopped from leaving the U.S. to visit other Latin American nations."

"To travel outside the country all anti-Castro refugee leaders must now convince both the State Department and Immigration officials that their trips have nothing to do with meeting other anti-Castro groups."

"Several Cuban refugees recently were arrested by the FBI for planning attacks against Cuban ships scheduled to dock in Canada. Hundreds of FBI, Immigration and Custom officials are specially assigned to in-

filtrate these anti-Castro groups to learn in advance of their plans so they can be thwarted. . . .

"All moves within the Nixon Administration to tighten up the quarantine of Cuba (A Nixon campaign promise—Ed.) have been blocked by Henry Kissinger. . . .

"In private conversations with foreign diplomats in Havana, Castro recently boasted that Nixon's campaign statements would never be carried out."

"President Nixon made a big mistake in publicly ruling out any military action against us," Castro told an Ambassador from a European country. "We really didn't know what he would do until he made that statement. Now we can continue to train guerrilla fighters for eventual use in the U.S. We know Nixon will not take any meaningful action against us."

Kissinger has not only blocked moves to tighten the economic quarantine of Cuba, he has ordered from the Rand Corporation a report on "the feasibility of restoring political, economic and cultural relations with Cuba." This is not because he wants to be friendly with all Latin American countries because he has also requested from the same think-tank a study "determining the circumstances under which the government of Brazil might be overthrown if it decides to expropriate American property." Castro has already taken care of all the expropriation and Kissinger does not seem upset. The difference could be that the Castro government is Communist and the Brazil government is anti-Communist.

Kissinger is most anxious to take care of the Cuban situation personally and has barred all other agencies of the government from asking for Cuban policy studies without his advance approval. The report he requested is to be paid for with Defense Department funds but Secretary of Defense Laird was not consulted about it. Kissinger encouraged persons working on Governor Nelson Rockefeller's Latin American report to recommend that U.S. resume normal trade relations with Cuba and also reportedly played a "major role" in getting the National Council of Churches to call for the reestablishment of diplomatic relations with Cuba and the dropping of the quarantine. He has also tried unsuccessfully to do away with travel restrictions from the United States to Cuba.

"To help these pro-Castro moves, stories are being circulated that Castro is 'souring' on Russia. This is the same old 'hogwash' we were fed when Castro was accomplishing his takeover of Cuba in the first place. We were told that Castro had to turn to the Communists for help when we refused to support him, thus 'creating a vacuum.' Castro gave the lie to this story when he publicly admitted he had been a Communist all along and always would be. The old story that a country is 'trying to break away from the domination of Moscow' is always used when the U.S. planners are trying to sell the public (of which they are still afraid) on the idea of giving foreign aid, increasing trade or resuming diplomatic and 'cultural' relations with a Communist country. How far Castro is from 'souring' on Moscow was revealed by a recent Cuban defector, Orlando Castro Hidalgo, a former high ranking Cuban intelligence officer.

He has warned that Castro is helping Moscow tighten its hold on Cuba under the terms of a secret agreement made in 1968. The Russian Communists have been granted naval and air base rights in Cuba in exchange for increased Soviet military and economic aid. The Soviets have been sending "technicians" to prepare and maintain these bases at which Russian ships, submarines and planes are to be stationed. Cuba is to be used as part of a network of military bases now being established around the world, in the Mediterranean, the Persian Gulf and Suez Canal and

around Africa. According to the defecting intelligence officer, "This outward movement of Soviet military power will see an increase in both the militancy of national-liberation wars and movements and in direct strategic Soviet support for them in Latin America, Africa and Asia."

Castro Hidalgo produced documents showing that Castro's intelligence service and secret police have been taken over by the Russians. This service is known as the General Directorate of Intelligence (GDI) and has received large amounts of money from Russia to extend its operations in Canada, Mexico and at the United Nations. He furnished details of how Cuban agents trained in Havana and Moscow have been infiltrated into the United States to make contact with militant student and Negro organizations.

Only recently a U.N. "diplomat" from Cuba was revealed to have attempted to bribe certain Cubans in Florida to infiltrate the Key Biscayne household of President Nixon, gain the confidence of other servants and the family and eventually request a transfer to Washington.

Another Communist country in which Henry Kissinger is interested is Romania, as he is credited with having arranged for President Nixon's unprecedented visit to that country. Arthur Schlesinger went to Romania to prepare for Nixon's visit and also to Russia for Astronaut Borman's visit there during which he was instructed to place a ceremonial wreath on the grave of Lenin, founder of Communism in Russia. The President's Romania visit was timed to coincide with Captive Nations Week by Kissinger, a deliberate negation of the rays of hope this small remembrance of their enslavement brings to the people suffering under Communist tyranny.

President Nixon's visit to Romania was so enjoyable that he has called for better and closer relations with that Communist nation. He posed with his arm around the Communist president and danced the "Romanian version" of the Hora, a Jewish folk-dance. He stated, upon his return to the United States, that Liberation is not possible, but Communication is, not a very comforting thought for the enslaved masses. In a joint United States-Romanian statement issued by President Nixon and President Nicolae Ceausescu, they declared:

"The two heads of state devoted particular attention also to the economic relations between their countries. While noting the upward trend which these relations have displayed in recent years they also agreed on the need in the interests of both countries to develop and diversify the economic ties between the United States and Romania. In this connection it was agreed to look for new ways of realizing the potentialities which this important field offers."

Subsequently introduced was a bill to be known as the Rumanian Trade Act of 1969 giving the President the authority to extend most-favored-nation treatment to Rumania "when it is determined to be in the national interest." Sen. Mondale stated: "The Rumanian Trade Act of 1969 responds to the spirit of the President's visit to Rumania. I hope that we can use this most opportune moment to put our economic relationship with another Eastern European (i.e. Communist-Ed.) nation on a normal basis . . . MFN treatment for Rumania, if coupled with the liberalization of the Export Control Act recommended by the Banking and Currency Committee, and reform of the Export-Import Act to permit extension of credit and guarantees to assist such trade, would go far to expand and normalize trade relations with Rumania and further prospects for understanding and peace. It would underscore the President's apt appeal to the 'spirit of Apollo.'"

Paul Scott had previously reported in his column:

"Highly significant moves are underway to

make Romania a member of the \$15 billion International Monetary Fund and the \$21 billion International Bank for Reconstruction & Development (World Bank).

"Such membership would open the door for the communist regime of President Ceausescu to obtain his long-term foreign credits he urgently needs to bolster his country's sagging economy.

"Britain, pantingly eager to expand its Iron Curtain trade, is spearheading the backstage drive to bring Romania into the IMF and World Bank.

"Prime Minister Wilson initiated the hush-hush overtures of Romania with the knowledge and encouraging approval of key-placed members of the Nixon Administration.

"Foremost among them are Henry Kissinger . . . and Secretary of State William Rogers.

"The heads of both powerful international financial organizations are credited as favoring Romania's membership. Robert McNamara, President of the World Bank, has favored both Romania and Russia's admission for some time."

Anthony C. Sutton, a research Fellow at the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace at Stanford University in California has prepared a study on the impact of Western technology on the Communist bloc for the past ten years. He concluded that "the single most important factor in Soviet economic and military developments has been the infusion of Western, primarily American origin, technology." The Export-Import Bank financed a deal for the Fiat automobile plant in the Soviet Union but the Fiat company relies mainly on U.S. suppliers. Even while the Soviet Army was invading Czechoslovakia, U.S. machine tool manufacturers were (and still are) shipping equipment to the USSR.

Sutton warned that if history is any guide, the Fiat plant will be used to produce military vehicles, adding that the distinction between civilian and military goods is fallacious. In attempting to get data for his study he was refused information (usually made public) by the Export-Import Bank concerning the Fiat deal. The Hon. Glenard P. Lipscomb discussed the role of the American Government in the Fiat-Soviet deal and the secrecy involved at that time (Congressional Record, October 17, 1966):

It had long been rumored that the agreement by the Fiat Automobile Co. of Italy to construct a large automobile factory in the Soviet Union, which became publicly known early in May of this year, really hinged on a secret agreement by officials of the U.S. Government that we would authorize shipment of machine tools from the United States for use in this plant. This has now been confirmed. . . .

"(FORBES) magazine reported that 'this arrangement has the approval of both the State Department and the Department of Commerce.' It further says that Fiat's former chairman and managing director, Vittorio Valletta, cleared this in advance in conference with Secretary of State Rusk and Secretary of Commerce Connor here in Washington early this year.

"Forbes further says that some U.S. machine tool makers already have agreed to supply Fiat with machinery for the U.S.S.R.

"The Forbes magazine article has another interesting comment. The article states:

"State and Commerce Department Officials have kept the U.S. role in the Fiat deal as hush-hush as possible. They were shocked when they heard Forbes had learned of Valletta's conversation with Rusk and Connor. They are frankly scared that, as the real story of the deal emerges, a clamor will arise to prevent U.S. firms from participating. . . ."

This same secrecy applies when one attempts to get information from the U.S. Government concerning firms doing business

with Communist countries. One might receive a letter similar to that written by the Director of the Office of Export Control of the Department of Commerce:

"We have given our careful consideration to the request . . . for a list of all commodities licensed for export to Communist countries in the past five years the identity of each exporter and each shipper, and the value of each commodity, which you enclosed in your letter to Secretary Stans. . . . For the reasons set forth below, we cannot comply with . . . (the) request for release of this specific information.

"Since export license applications are accepted from exporters with the understanding that the information therein is to be deemed confidential . . . (the) request was considered in the light of Section 6(c) of the Export Control Act of 1949. This section provides, in effect, that information obtained under this Act that is deemed confidential shall not be published or disclosed unless the Secretary of Commerce determines that withholding of this information would be contrary to the national interest.

"The purpose of Section 6(c) of the Export Control Act is to afford the business community protection for the detailed commercial information that must be disclosed in applying for an export license. We have exercised extreme care in guarding confidential information requested and received from American businessmen. . . .

"The subject of the confidentiality of the type of information requested was raised in 1961, and the present policy was set forth at that time by then Secretary Hodges. This policy of confidentiality has been affirmed by every Secretary of Commerce since; most recently by Secretary Stans in connection with a request for similar information by a private citizen conducting research for a book on the Soviet economy. The Department's policy of treating as confidential the names of persons or firms receiving export licenses is, we believe both in the public interest and in accord with the intent of Congress as expressed in Section 6(c) of the Export Control Act and in Subsection e(3) of the Freedom of Information Act. . . ."

The U.S. Government is protecting the firms doing business with Communist countries from possible reprisals by Americans opposed to trading with the enemy. At present we are fighting a war in Vietnam and our boys are dying because of arms and materiel supplied to North Vietnam by Communist countries with whom we are still trading. Not only that, but at the recent World Communist Conference, an appeal was issued to all workers to boycott supplies bound for U.S. troops in South Vietnam. The 75-nation conference called for the boycott in a document giving full support to North Vietnamese and Viet Cong proposals toward ending the Vietnam war. The document congratulated the Vietnamese Communists on their "historic successes scored in the struggle against United States imperialism." At this conference Leonid Brezhnev, general secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, stated: "We have ahead of us trying battles with a strong, experienced and cunning class enemy . . . having united our ranks and coordinated our actions, we shall win these battles." The "cunning class enemy" is, of course, "U.S. imperialism" and there was no talk of "peaceful coexistence" or "spurring better relations." Such talk is saved for the gullible (?) American leaders and their advisers who are really not that gullible.

[From the Berkeley (Calif.) Times, Aug. 16, 1969]

SECRET STUDIES ORDERED ON
STARTLING QUESTIONS
(By Flora Lewis)

WASHINGTON.—Henry Kissinger, the White House national security adviser, has ordered

some secret studies from the Rand Corporation on some startling questions.

They do not represent any policy decisions. But they are highly unusual and raise strange implications about some of Kissinger's ideas and his method of operating with the rest of the government.

According to reliable sources, these are the questions Rand has been asked to study for the National Security Council:

1. Circumstances in which American nuclear weapons might be used in the Middle East.
2. Circumstances in which the government of Brazil might be overthrown if it decides to expropriate American assets.
3. Feasibility of restoring political, economic and cultural relations with Castro's Cuba.
4. Prospects for nuclear proliferation around the world, in addition to the five existing nuclear powers.

There was a fifth question put to Rand under the same contract. It was for a study on the danger and extent of insurgency in Thailand. That was a rush job with a September 1 deadline for delivery to the National Security Council. The others were ordered for completion as quickly as possible.

The contract with Rand, a private study organization, by-passed all the government intelligence and planning agencies; it was made through a Defense Department agency but on behalf of the National Security Council. It guaranteed Rand \$210,000 plus \$12,500 for travel expenses, but another \$500,000 was set aside to be made available if Rand needed and could find suitable extra staff for the job.

The Pentagon was not told what questions would be posed when it negotiated the contract. By a series of stumbles, Defense Secretary Melvin Laird happened to find out about the Thai study. He was angry and complained that Kissinger was using Defense funds to end-run the Pentagon. But when he complained, he wasn't told about the other studies. He has just found out about those and was doubly sore.

The questions do not mean that Kissinger is recommending the actions implied. In a sense, the Middle East and Brazil studies are about the "unthinkable." But the government does not buy such studies idly, for the exercise.

It isn't unusual, as former high defense officials point out, to contract for private studies on international security questions. But these officials say such studies are for one of two reasons: Either a new question has arisen which government agencies aren't in a position to answer as needed, or someone in a high position wants a new answer to an old question and can't get it inside the government.

The second reason was almost certainly the motive for the Thai study, which is expected to show the insurgency danger much less than the Pentagon estimates and therefore to undercut any U.S. Army pressure to move troops withdrawn from Vietnam into Thailand. President Nixon in effect anticipated this conclusion with his policy comments during his Far Eastern tour.

The same reason is probably behind the Cuba question. Government agencies, especially the CIA, tend to be hard-line about Cuba. They consider it so mired in Maoism that complete quarantine is the only way to prevent a spread of Cuba-backed rebellions.

The question on Brazil is ominous. There is intelligence that the Brazilian military government is considering expropriation of all American assets. It is in serious political and financial trouble, and the example of Peru's expropriation of the International Petroleum Company, a subsidiary of Standard Oil of New Jersey, is tempting. That brought the Peruvian military government wide national support.

The Middle East question is the most ominous of all, "simply insane," a former defense official in the Johnson administration called it. The context is not at all clear. Presumably, it contemplates a "demonstration" nuclear blast on some Egyptian target if Israel were in danger of annihilation, since there is no suggestion of using nuclear weapons against Soviet forces in the area. Israeli officials deny any knowledge of the question and shrug it off as totally unnecessary and irrelevant to their defense situation.

There is concern over the fact that the Egyptian army has jammed most of its equipment as well as its strength into forward positions between Cairo and the Suez Canal. But there is nothing visible in current U.S. military assessments of the Middle East situation to justify the most hypothetical question of using American atomic weapons there.

The extraordinary points in all this are the questions and the fact that Kissinger ordered the studies with Pentagon money but without telling Laird. The White House Kissinger shop, as it's called, is operating in a very different way from previous security advisers. And contrary to public impression, it is not at all unusual for the government to put hair-raising questions to private companies for mere mental calisthenics. There has to be some policy purpose for spending the money.

Kissinger isn't telling what it is.

[From the Evening Star, Sept. 22, 1969]

TRICIA ATTENDS OPENING

Tricia Nixon flies to Philadelphia this afternoon to attend the opening of a Brancusi exhibition and dinner at the Philadelphia Museum of Art.

Escorted by John McIlvain, Miss Nixon will receive guests beside the Ambassador of Romania and Mrs. Cornelius Bogdan, who will also be honor guests at the Romanian sculptor's show.

Attending the black tie dinner and the exhibit will be museum president and Mrs. Evan Turner, George M. Cheston, museum director and Mrs. Cheston, and Mrs. John Russell, chairman of the women's committee.

Mrs. Emile Geyelin, president of the Alliance Francaise in Philadelphia, will represent French cultural interests at the affair. Brancusi became a French citizen.

Miss Nixon will fly privately to Philadelphia, alone, according to the White House this morning.

[From the Washington Intelligence Report, June 1969]

COMMUNISTS UNITED AGAINST AMERICA

(By Herbert A. Philbrick)

"Unity of the Communist and anti-imperialist forces on a new and higher level is the chief achievement of the recently concluded 75-party conference (in Moscow, U.S.S.R.). That is the opinion of Henry Winston, General Secretary, Communist Party U.S.A., who headed the U.S. delegation to the meeting."

So boasted the Red "Daily World," official communist party newspaper in the United States, reporting the meeting of the Communist International held at the world headquarters in Moscow, June 5-8, 1969.

One of the most significant of all the proposals to come out of the communist meeting in Moscow was the Red call for a "broad world anti-imperialist conference" to be held at an undetermined date in the future, in addition to the designation of Sunday, July 20 as an "international day of struggle to end the war in Vietnam."

It is clear that the Communist bosses in Moscow are hoping, through the "world anti-imperialist conference," to mobilize non-communist as well as communist forces in a massive frontal attack against the United

States. In communist lingo, "imperialist forces" are those countries, including the United States, who are not yet controlled by a Red dictatorship, or who have a free, non-socialist economy.

Gus Hall, convicted criminal and head of the communist apparatus in America expressed great optimism as to the results of the smash-America project, declaring that "the greater cohesion of Communist Parties will act as a powerful force of attraction for non-Communist anti-imperialists everywhere."

Hall arrived in Moscow accompanied by U.S. Communist comrades Henry Winston, Helen Winter, Louis Weinstein, and James Jackson. The U.S. communist delegation was met by a top Soviet militarist, Comrade D. F. Ustinov of the Soviet Central Committee. It was Ustinov who, in January of 1966, journeyed to communist Hanoi with a Soviet delegation led by A. N. Shelepin. As the Central Committee Secretary for Defense and Armaments, Ustinov negotiated the supplying of arms and ammunition to the North Vietnamese Communists to be used in its aggression in South Vietnam.

The Red writer, Mike Davidow, who serves as the Daily World "foreign correspondent" in Moscow, reported that the "delegates" from 75 Communist and Workers organizations "representing millions of communists" had "unanimously called for all-out support of the heroic people of Vietnam, calling for united struggle against imperialism, and particularly against U.S. imperialism."

Davidow wrote that "when Luis Corvalan, Communist Party of Chile declared the appeal was unanimously adopted, the delegates broke into prolonged applause."

The unanimously adopted resolution also called for the boycott of transportation of troops, weapons and supplies to the free Vietnamese (but no boycott against troops, weapons and supplies for the communist aggressors) and invited "progressives" the world over to join with the Communists to "stop U.S. aggression."

Communist Rumania, which likes to boast an "independent communist line" was one of the official 75 communist and workers parties at the Moscow convention. Upon the return of Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu, Secretary General of the Rumanian Communist Party Central Committee, a plenum of the Central Committee issued an official statement which declared that "the plenum fully approves the activity carried out at the conference by our party's delegation . . . activity which has received the unanimous approval and complete support of the party organizations, of all the communists, and of the working people of the entire country." The "plenum" especially praised the Rumanian delegation for its "contribution . . . to the development of the relations of solidarity with the communist and workers parties in the spirit of trust and mutual respect, on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism."

While expressing "reservations" with the documents approved at the international communist conference, the Rumanian Central Committee plenum rubber stamped the Moscow declarations, and pledged its "determination to work firmly in order to contribute to the achievement of the basic objectives of the anti-imperialist struggle."

Upon their return to the United States from the Moscow meeting, Communist bosses Hall and Winston told a gathering of the pro-Soviet faithful in New York that they had held "a number of meetings with fraternal parties, among them the Communist

*This important element in communist theory and practice—"Proletarian Internationalism"—will be discussed at length in a forthcoming issue of the Washington Intelligence Report.

Party of Cuba." As a result, Hall and Winston said, they will lead an official delegation of the C.P.U.S.A. to Cuba for a two-week visit in August.

All of the evidence from the meeting of 75 world communist organizations in Moscow show that they were united, indeed enthusiastically united, in their common and never-changing goal to one day destroy the United States as a free nation, and to impose a communist dictatorship over the people of America. There was not one shred of evidence to be found in anything said or done at the international meeting of communists to indicate the slightest dissent or disagreement by any communist party in any country that it was not their intention to work together toward that goal.

Yet there exists in this country, in certain circles, a dangerous unreality which holds that communists don't exist, or that if they do exist, they pose no danger to the free nations of the world.

According to press reports, at a hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in Washington, witness Dr. Karl Menninger told of the employee who threw scraps of yellow paper on the railroad tracks. When he was asked why, he said that it was to ward off elephants. Someone said there were no elephants around there. He said, "See, it is already working."

One newspaper story said, a spectator to a full round of applause and laughter from the audience, chimed in, "And is that why we are about to deploy the Anti-Ballistic Missiles?"

"You said it," Dr. Menninger grinned.

Rational people will agree that the Communists, by their own statements and actions over the past 53 years, pose a grave danger to any free society. Far more dangerous to the security of the world, however, are those individuals who think that Communists, like Dr. Menninger's mythical elephants, don't exist.

DELEGATES TO MOSCOW

Most of the "liberal" newspapers and columnists in the United States, if they mentioned the meeting of the communist international at all, went out of their way to emphasize the very few communist countries who were not there—such as Red China, Communist Albania, etc.

Herewith, from official Communist sources, is the list of communist delegations who were there.

Communist Party of Australia,
Communist Party of Austria,
Socialist Vanguard Party of Algeria,
Communist Party of Argentina,
Communist Party of Belgium,
Socialist Unity Party of West Berlin,
Bulgarian Communist Party,
Communist Party of Bolivia,
Brazilian Communist Party,
Communist Party of Great Britain,
Hungarian Socialist Workers Party,
Communist Party of Venezuela,
United Party of Haitian Communists,
People's Progressive Party of Guyana,
Guadeloupe Communist Party,
Guatemala Party of Labour,
Communist Party of Germany,
Socialist Unity Party of Germany,
Communist Party of Honduras,
Communist Party of Greece,
Danish Communist Party,
Dominican Communist Party,
Community Party of Israel,
Indian Communist Party,
Communist Party of Jordan,
Communist Party of Iraq,
People's Party of Iran,
Communist Party of Northern Ireland,
Labour Party of Ireland,
Communist Party of Spain,
Italian Communist Party,
Canadian Communist Party,

Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus,

Communist Party of Colombia,
People's Vanguard of Costa Rica Party,
Communist Party of Cuba (as an observer),
Communist Party of Luxembourg,
Party of Liberation and Socialism (Morocco),
Martinique Communist Party,
Mexican Communist Party,
Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party,
Party of Nigerian Marxism-Leninists,
Nicaraguan Socialist Party,
Communist Party of Norway,
Communist Party of East Pakistan,
People's Party of Panama,
Paraguayan Communist Party,
Peruvian Communist Party,
Polish United Workers Party,
Portuguese Communist Party,
Rumanian Communist Party,
Communist Party of Salvador,
San Marino Communist Party,
Syrian Communist Party,
Communist Party of the Soviet Union,
Communist Party of the United States,
Communist Party of the Sudan,
Tunisian Communist Party,
Communist Party of Turkey,
Communist Party of Uruguay,
Communist Party of Finland,
French Communist Party,
Communist Party of Ceylon,
Communist Party of Czechoslovakia,
Communist Party of Chile,
Swiss Labour Party,
Left Party-Communists of Sweden (as observers),

Communist Party of Ecuador,
South African Communist Party, and two parties working underground whose names are not given to conceal their identity.

THREE MARYLAND GI'S DIE IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Gerry D. Rice, Pfc. William H. Waldman, and L. Cpl. Leland A. Bailey, three fine young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend their courage and honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

THREE MARYLAND GI'S DIE IN VIETNAM—MARINES KILLED IN COMBAT IN DIFFERENT AREAS

Three Maryland marines have been killed in three Vietnam combat actions, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

They were:

Pfc. Gerry D. Rice, 20, of the 3100 block of Grace road, Baltimore, who was killed September 18 in a fire fight near Khe Sanh.

Pfc. William H. Waldman, Jr., 21, Berkshire, in Prince Georges county, who died from fragmentation wounds he suffered in a battle near Cam Lou, in Quan Tri province, on September 17.

Lance Cpl. Leland A. Bailey, 18 of Middle River, who died September 20 at a military hospital in Da Nang from wounds received during a September 11 combat operation in Quang Nam province.

Private Rice, a graduate of the Sparrows Point Senior High School, arrived in Vietnam just over a month ago after spending a 10 day leave at home.

He is survived by his wife, Mrs. Betty K.

Rice, and his parents, who live in the North Point area of Baltimore county.

Private Waldman was a 1967 graduate of Suitland Senior High School who enlisted in November, 1967. He had been in Vietnam for just over a month.

His mother, Mrs. Mary Waldman, said yesterday that the young marine used to write them after major battles to assure them that he was unhurt.

Besides his parents, Mr. and Mrs. William H. Waldman, he is survived by two sisters, Susan Waldman and Patty Waldman, and a brother, Robert Waldman.

Corporal Bailey, who had attended the Overlea Senior High School, enlisted in June, 1968, and was sent to Vietnam in December.

He is survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Bernard A. Bailey, and three brothers, Roland Bailey, Leonard C. Bailey, and Marvin Bailey.

POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY UNDERGOING REAPPRAISAL

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very fascinating commentary on the relative strength of various political philosophies appeared in the September 5 New World, the official publication of the Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago, in an article by Columnist Jeffrey Hart. Since the political philosophy of the American public seems to be undergoing reappraisal, Mr. Hart's commentary is quite timely:

CREATED BY MEDIA: LIBERAL MAJORITY—"JUST AN ILLUSION"

(By Jeffrey Hart)

As most readers of this paper doubtless know, the magazine, The Public Interest, was started four years ago with the intention of using the social sciences to illuminate our public problems.

Its contributors are mostly academicians, though not invariably: Irving Kristol, a publisher and a generalist, is one of the editors; and it is a very distinguished journal.

Daniel Bell, Nathan Glazer and Daniel Patrick Moynihan, for example, are closely associated with it, and put in frequent appearances in its pages.

The current issue (Summer 1969) contains an article of the first importance by Kristol and Paul Weaver, a Harvard professor, entitled "Who Knows New York?—Notes on a Mixed-up City," an article which deserves the widest possible audience, for its significance extends far beyond the city of New York.

Briefly, Kristol and Weaver have two important points to make.

First, they point out that the media convey an utterly false picture of urban reality. The result is that active politicians and leading journalists are frequently "blithely unaware of the kinds of people who live in their city, of where they live and how, of what their condition is and of what their problems are."

Kristol and Weaver give numerous examples of this. The media have made us aware, for example, of New York's Negro population, Harlem, Bedford-Stuyvesant, Ocean Hill-Brownsville—the names of these Negro neighborhoods—are familiar to a nationwide audience.

Yet in the coming election the combined Negro-Puerto Rican vote will be around 15 per cent of the electorate; there are as many

Italians in the Bronx as there are Negroes in Harlem, and they vote. But they are invisible to the mass media—to TV, to the Times, etc.

Any black militant who shows up at City Hall, with a list of demands will find the attention of the media focused upon him; his visage will glare out over the TV screen on the evening's news. The other 85 per cent of the electorate remains terra incognita.

How come? Kristol and Weaver argue that the editors and reporters and network executives entertain a number of general ideas about the "urban crisis" which distracts their attention from the empirical particulars of the city they live in. Their awareness, moreover, is largely confined to Manhattan where they live and work.

"Most of the editors of these magazines, most of the executives of these networks have visited Paris far more often than they have visited Brooklyn and can find their way around St. Germain des Pres though they would be forever lost in Bensonhurst."

The result is that the media produce a highly distorted image of the urban reality, frequently propose schemes such as "decentralization" and "community control of the schools" which turn out to be unworkable if not disastrous, and, finally, are inevitably surprised by the results of elections and other political phenomena.

Decentralization and community control of services—currently a fashionable nostrum—would, Kristol and Weaver point out, function in practice to freeze existing neighborhoods, inhibit Negro mobility, and create a kind of apartheid.

In response to the demands of militants, the opinion-making elite is in the process of lowering the standards at the city colleges, once excellent institutions, thus nullifying them as instruments of upward mobility for blacks and whites alike.

The opinion makers, comments the article sardonically, imagine that since the militants use such earthy language they have grassroots support.

As the result of such illusions, the opinion makers and the governing elite now find themselves in a startling circumstance: their favored candidate, John Lindsay, was rejected by the Republican primary, carrying only the borough of Manhattan; and it now looks very possible that he will run third behind Marchi and Proccacino.

Kristol and Weaver have a second major point to make, and it too has national significance. "Those people who consider themselves to be liberals have never been, in the nation as a whole, more than a tiny fraction of the rather odd coalition that makes up the Democratic party."

"They were, for the most part, upper income WASPs and Jews, had gone to the better universities, were professionals of one sort or another, and lived in the great metropolises of the northeast or California."

"Through their persistence, expertise, and articulateness, these liberals managed to control the presidential wing of the Democratic party, from which position they exercised an ever-expanding moral hegemony over most of the nation's public institutions."

"By the early 1960s, things had come to the point where a man of even modest aspirations in government, law, medicine, business, communications, or the academy found it difficult not to be a liberal."

Yet this liberal hegemony fostered a pervasive illusion: that because liberals governed, and set the moral and intellectual tone of our public life, liberalism represented a majority opinion.

In reality, the liberals governed through a kind of log-rolling strategy, giving to each of many groups something it needed or wanted: subsidies for the farmers, welfare to the indigent, civil rights to the Negro, favorable legislation to the unions, and so forth. But the

votes of these various groups did not by any means, as the liberals imagined, mean concurrence in liberal doctrine.

"Just beneath the surface of public discussion, there remained big differences of opinion between liberals and the bulk of their supporters, whose non-liberal views found persistent representation in Congress, the State legislatures, and the city councils."

This has now become manifest as events have shattered the old liberal coalition. Despite the adulation of the media, a liberal candidate for President cannot count on carrying a single southern state. The liberal candidate for mayor of New York, the "nation's most liberal city," is almost certain to lose.

On issues like integration, law and order, pornography, and civilian review boards, the majority is heavily against the liberal positions.

"New York" conclude Kristol and Weaver, "has seemingly passed beyond liberalism to—well, what New York is coming to is impossible to foretell, but how it is getting there is only too clear."

To complete their thesis, to fill in the gap in that last sentence, Kristol and Weaver need only consult Kevin Phillips' new book, "The Emerging Republican Majority."

ANNIVERSARY OF DANVILLE TOBACCO ASSOCIATION

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, one of the principal cash crops of American farmers is that of tobacco, and one of the principal tobacco-growing States is Virginia. From the earliest days of our Nation tobacco has held an important place in the economy. For the past century the Danville Tobacco Association has served the tobacco industry and this week the association is marking its 100th anniversary.

As part of this observance those who produce this important commodity were saluted on Growers Day at Danville, Va. Speaker for the occasion was the Honorable William E. Galbraith, Under Secretary of Agriculture. His remarks will be of interest to my colleagues and I insert them in the RECORD:

SPEECH BY DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY WILLIAM E. GALBRAITH, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, BEFORE THE DANVILLE TOBACCO ASSOCIATION, BALLOU PARK, DANVILLE, VIRGINIA, ON GROWERS DAY, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1969, AT 2:30 P.M.

It is a real pleasure and a privilege for me to be here today to join you in celebrating the One Hundredth Anniversary of the Danville Tobacco Association.

You have a right to be proud of this organization. The men who founded it and those who have maintained it through the years stand among the fabled Captains of Industry who laid the industrial foundations of these United States.

They merit special recognition that I am sure all Virginians accord them for establishing this great community in history as the cradle of leaf tobacco marketing and manufacturing.

The tobacco industry and the Nation as a whole have been well served by the Danville

Tobacco Association for all of the 100 years since 1869.

On behalf of the Secretary of Agriculture I congratulate the Danville Tobacco Association on having achieved this centennial. I further wish to commend the City of Danville and the Centennial Committee for the fine job done in putting on this week-long celebration. You do honor not only to yourselves, to your Governor and to your history-steeped State—you do honor to our country.

At the outset let me assure you that Under Secretary J. Phil Campbell would have loved nothing better than being here with you today as he had planned.

Ever since your very able Chairman, George Myers, first contacted him, Phil has been enthusiastic about this celebration. He was enthusiastic because he has known and worked with tobacco people for many years.

When he was Commissioner of Agriculture for the State of Georgia, he had the opportunity of setting the date for the opening of the tobacco market. And today he enjoys recalling his relationship with the tobacco industry and the people in it.

So be assured that the only reason Phil Campbell isn't here is due to an act of Congress—in this case that act was an invitation from the House Committee on Agriculture. That is why instead of being here today Phil Campbell is with Secretary Hardin on Capitol Hill, presenting to the Congress and to the American people proposals out of which will come a new farm program—a program that hopefully will solve some of the problems that confront this Nation—including the cost-price squeeze that is ham-stringing our farmers.

Now, I didn't come here to dampen the high spirits of this Centennial celebration by reciting a list of problems and statistics, but I am sure you will agree that during the observation of any great milestone such as this, it's just good sense to pause for a moment and take a collective look at where we are and where we are headed. We live in the present and we deal with the future. So, I want to talk with you a moment about where we are headed in agriculture.

CONGRESSMAN DANIEL

Before I get into this, I'd like to recognize another man who is a great friend of tobacco people. He is a very good friend to me who just happens to be a Congressman, and a man from this area.

I'm talking about the Honorable W. C. Daniel, Representative from Virginia's 5th Congressional District. Dan is doing a great job in the Congress, and if you don't already know it, I don't mind telling you we need more men like him in the Congress.

We need men like Dan for many reasons, but one reason is the fact that he is a friend and a supporter of agriculture, and never before did agriculture need friends so badly. But I'll say more about that later.

I think everybody knows that tobacco is an important industry in these United States, but let's take a brief look at the impact the industry has made on our economy.

The dollar value of farm sales of tobacco in the United States last year was \$1.2 billion. Cash receipts on finished tobacco products total \$9.9 billion. The total taxes—local, State, and Federal—derived from tobacco amounted to \$4.4 billion.

Today, tobacco is grown on about 535,000 farms in the United States, and there are some 75,000 people employed by the tobacco industry in manufacturing alone.

In Virginia—in the Old Dominion—tobacco accounts for 36 per cent of cash returns from all crops.

TOBACCO PROGRAMS

I think most of us would agree that tobacco programs have worked fairly well.

When problems came up, the industry and government—both the legislative and executive branches—cooperated to work out solutions.

The present tobacco program is a direct descendant of actions taken back in 1933—a production control program supplemented by the use of marketing agreements to raise the prices of several types of tobacco. With rare exception, programs have been in effect continuously to the present day with the support of tobacco growers, in referendum.

But there have been problems which occasionally have required a change in programs. In the early 1960's for example, increases in yields per acre under the straight acreage marketing quota program affected tobacco quality adversely and put the whole program in jeopardy.

The result was enactment in 1965 of the acreage-poundage legislation which was then approved by growers.

Acreage-poundage has been in effect beginning with the 1965 crop. It has helped to hold down production. And it has put the emphasis back on quality rather than quantity of production.

Generally, acreage-poundage has had a beneficial effect on exports, and on returns to growers. However, supplies are not yet in line with demand, due largely to the decline in domestic use of flue-cured tobacco in recent years. You may recall that during the 1964-65 marketing year, the supply of flue-cured tobacco was sufficient for three years—at the rate we were then using it and exporting it. Current estimates suggest the present supply is sufficient for about 2.7 years.

I believe it is generally agreed that a supply of about two and one-half years is desirable for flue-cured tobacco. So, while progress has been made in bringing supplies in line with demand, the job is not yet done.

BURLEY TOBACCO

Now, about burley. Successive reductions in acreage allotments in 1964, 1965, and 1966 have brought about some reduction in burley stocks. In fact, since 1965 total burley stocks have been reduced by 104 million pounds, but as of April 1, government loan holdings were up to 33 million pounds.

A special referendum among burley growers on two occasions has been short of the two-thirds majority required by law to change the program to acreage-poundage. A decision will be made before next February 1 as to whether acreage-poundage will be offered again to burley growers.

For other kinds of tobacco, supplies are in reasonable balance with demand, except possibly for dark air-cured types grown in Kentucky and Tennessee.

EXPORT MARKET

Looking at the export picture, tobacco makes an important contribution to international trade and to our balance of payments position. For many years, tobacco has ranked among the five most important agricultural export commodities in the United States, with total tobacco exports running about \$600 million in value each year.

However, as you know, for several years prior to 1966, our share of world tobacco trade was declining.

From an annual average of just under 500 million pounds during the 1961-65 period, our exports of unmanufactured leaf have risen steadily to about 600 million pounds in 1968.

This was the largest volume since 1946, and the highest value ever—\$524 million. When you add the value of manufactured products exports to the leaf, you get a record total value of \$686 million in tobacco exports during 1968. About 95 percent of these sales were for dollars, and this made a significant

contribution to the Nation's balance of payments.

World cigarette output continues to climb, and we expect it to continue to increase at about 2.5 percent a year and to exceed 3 billion output by 1975.

The acreage-poundage program for flue-cured tobacco has contributed significantly to the improved export situation for U.S. tobacco. Many of our foreign customers indicate that further improvement in quality and better sorting and preparation for market will further enhance our export opportunities.

But the record for the past three years has been very good and it will be difficult to improve on it.

EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET

As you know, one of the major problems facing tobacco at this time is continued access to the Common Market in Europe, popularly called the EC.

This is the largest single tobacco market in the world, and the largest for U.S. tobacco. In 1968 we exported about 165 million pounds to the EC, or about 28 percent of our total tobacco exports.

As a result of the Kennedy Round negotiations, the Common External Tariff on tobacco imports to the EC was reduced.

With a reduced duty structure and no impairment of these concessions, we normally would expect the U.S. to hold its own, and possibly make some gains in tobacco exports to the EC in the period ahead.

However, we are deeply concerned about the proposed Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) for tobacco in the European Community. We have become increasingly troubled by possible implications for our tobacco exports if the features in the Commission's proposed CAP for tobacco are adopted.

Some of the objectionable features of primary concern are:

- (a) High price guarantees with no production control.
- (b) Buyer's premium.
- (c) Harmonization of excise taxes.
- (d) Only minor reforms in tobacco monopolies.
- (e) Duty preference for Associated Overseas Territories.
- (f) Provisions for an export subsidy.
- (g) Requirement for an import certificate and surety deposit system.

If adopted, these features could adversely affect our tobacco trade. As you might expect, we have vigorously opposed this proposal, and we have advised EC officials that if a tobacco regulation is adopted that impairs our existing trade concessions, we will move swiftly to restore the balance of trade advantage between us.

In addition to this situation in EC, we face increased competition from foreign producers of light cigarette leaf tobacco.

The decline in flue-cured production in Rhodesia has led to increased production in several developing countries like Mexico, Yugoslavia, Tanzania, South Korea, Pakistan and Thailand.

These tobaccos are lower in quality than U.S. flue-cured, but some of them are in strong demand on the world market because their price is about one-half the level of the U.S. export price.

And production of burley tobacco outside the U.S. has risen rapidly in recent years, a trend expected to continue, for although foreign manufacturers like the quality of U.S. burley, they complain about the sharp increase in prices.

INDUSTRY CHALLENGES

These are some of the challenges the tobacco industry faces. They are intensified there by the added factors of the smoking and health issue, and high cost of production with resulting high leaf price.

At present it requires 400 to 450 man-

hours to produce an acre of tobacco. In an effort to help lower production costs, while improving tobacco quality, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has some intensive tobacco research projects underway. Much of this work is done cooperatively with the various tobacco-growing States and private industry.

The most immediate need is mechanization, an area in which some progress has been made.

Research is also being intensified on smoking and health. We're trying to determine what substances in tobacco smoke may be injurious to health, and then either to remove these substances or prevent them from forming. And care is being taken to avoid loss of any of the tobacco's desirable flavor and aroma.

In the area of marketing, studies are underway to prevent tobacco deterioration caused by fungi and bacteria during transport and storage. These studies are also concerned with improving methods for controlling insects that infest stored tobacco.

I could go on—because the tobacco story is a long and interesting one, but now, I invite you to take a look at some broader issues that face us as people interested in agriculture, and as Americans.

I said earlier that the tobacco industry and government are cooperating on research projects. I regret I cannot say that is true within the tobacco industry.

Supporters of the tobacco program has not always recognized the need to work with and for each other. And sometimes groups within the industry tend to isolate themselves from other actions within the community.

I want to take this opportunity to tell you that tobacco growers and everybody in agriculture must get together if we are to be an effective influence in the Congress.

REPRESENTATION IN CONGRESS

For most of our history, representatives of agricultural interests in the Congress were a decided majority. That day has passed. There are no longer enough legislators from farm districts in the U.S. Congress to enact by themselves the kind of farm programs the country needs—programs such as Secretary Hardin and Under-Secretary Campbell are presenting before the House Committee today.

Today's Congress is an urban-oriented Congress, and a simple fact of life is that city Congressmen will naturally give greater attention to city problems.

Congressmen who represent agriculture must support some of the things city people need and want if we are to continue to have farm programs we need.

City Congressmen control the future legislative and financial support of agriculture. This is a recent development, but it is one that will be with us from now on as farmers become a tiny minority in the Nation's population—10 million out of 200 million, or a scant five percent.

Now, I don't think we need to get disturbed about the plight of agriculture because we are a minority. If this realization prods us to act with greater unity, greater energy, and greater imagination, then agriculture has nothing to fear.

I can't impress too strongly the importance of this as Congress today begins consideration of new farm legislation for the years beyond 1970.

You, and I, and all of us interested in agriculture need to re-evaluate agriculture's position and strength—its political position and its status in the public mind.

We must broaden our interests to include the many areas of vital concern that today confront America, and we must let our rural Congressmen know that we will support them when they work with city Congressmen on programs of improved housing, feeding pro-

grams, urban development, narcotics control, crime control, rat control and water and air pollution.

There are some other vital concerns on which we as Americans must work more closely together and in conclusion, I'd like to just touch on a few.

VIETNAM

One is the need to bring to an honorable and just end the war in Vietnam. As President Nixon has said, nothing has commanded so much of his time and energy since January 20 as the search for a way to bring lasting peace in Vietnam.

We all want an end to this conflict. But, in the President's words, "we want to end it permanently so that the younger brothers of our soldiers in Vietnam will not have to fight in the future in another Vietnam, some place in the world."

Another vital issue is to assure the military strength needed to back up American diplomacy. This is why the decision was made to proceed with the anti-ballistic missile system.

Still another vital concern is to stem the upward spiral of inflation that has been threatening the economy and wiping out progress of farmers, workers and consumers in recent years.

The battle against inflation is a fight that involves all of us. It cannot be won without strong support from all segments of the economy—and this means strong vocal support as well as individual and group action.

The President has proposed a budget designed to produce a surplus—a surplus that is essential if we are to curb inflation. And he has asked Congress to extend the income tax surcharge. The President is committed to eventual elimination of the surtax, but if we are to win the war against inflation, we need the revenues that will be produced by extending the surtax.

Agriculture is moving into the economic and political mainstream. We cannot consider the needs of farmers apart from their markets, suppliers, and processors. Whether they be growers of tobacco or other commodities, we can no longer separate the needs of farmers from other priorities that concern America.

That is why I took this opportunity to point out to you some of the most vital concerns now before us.

As we pause here on this One Hundredth Anniversary of Perseverance and progress, let's rededicate our energies toward greater unity and understanding—between farmers and farm organizations, agriculture and agribusiness, country people and city people—in short, let's speak up and work for America.

This is the way to push off toward another 100 years and a better future for the tobacco industry, for agriculture as a whole, and for all the people of America.

"A CALL TO ACTION"—CHALLENGE TO THE INDIVIDUAL FOR AMERICA'S BICENTENNIAL

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, one of America's best known poets, Walt Whitman, once wrote that—

An individual is as superb as a nation when he has qualities which make a superb nation.

Ours is a superb nation, and as we look toward the celebration of our 200th birthday in 1976, we can take pride in many notable achievements. However, as

the Parade editorial in the Washington Post of September 21 points out: Man has conquered space through the dedicated commitment and teamwork of the best minds of this country; we can and must conquer our myriad social and economic ills—but this will be possible only if, individually, we have the minds and hearts to do it.

Parade's call for the age of the possible is reminiscent of the late Senator Robert Kennedy's comment that—

Some men see things as they are and ask, "Why"—I dream things that never were, and ask, "Why not?"

As we look toward 1976, this is a worthy challenge for each of us.

I applaud the Parade editorial and include it at this point in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Washington Post, Parade magazine, Sept 21, 1969]

A CALL TO ACTION

In less than seven years, the United States will celebrate its 200th anniversary as a nation.

On July 4, 1976, our President and assorted orators will congratulate us as a people on our many and monumental achievements.

Not the least of course, will be our landing of Americans on the moon.

Having harnessed our special strengths—money, men, materials and the organizational genius to control them—we conquered space before 1970.

Why can we not conquer some of our social problems on earth by 1976?

Parade today suggests that if we can put men on the moon, then surely we can eradicate hunger in our nation by that target date.

Surely by then we can cleanse the air we've poisoned and the water we've polluted.

Surely—by concentrating our scientists and resources in a crash program such as the Manhattan Project in World War II that created the A-bomb in five years—we can produce a cure for cancer.

Surely we can build adequate housing for the poor and end some of our educational and economic injustices.

But first we must make one or some or all of these achievements a national goal and July 4, 1976, a national deadline.

Can we do this? A nation that has conquered the secrets of space and nature in record time can with strong leadership conquer problems of poverty, pollution, and spirit.

In part it will be a matter of money. More important, it will be a matter of attitude—of discipline and compassion.

If each of us can change his mind and heart, only a little, America will have entered the Age of the Possible. And we will proudly record on the 200th anniversary of the Republic that we reached the moon and put our glory to work at home.

TRIBUTE TO A VALIANT YOUNG SOLDIER

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with you and my colleagues in Congress the tragic and eloquent eulogy to a young soldier from Texas, who gave his life for his country on the battlefield in Vietnam.

The following obituary appeared in the Houston Chronicle and impressed me deeply.

To the parents of Sp5c Marvin Ray Robinson, and to his relatives and his many friends at the Alabama-Coushatta Indian Reservation in Texas, I extend my heartfelt and deepest sympathy. I share with you the great hope so eloquently expressed in the tribute to this valiant young soldier:

MARVIN RAY ROBINSON

SP5 Marvin Ray Robinson, 23, the last surviving male heir of the chiefs of the Coushatta Indians, the only son of Mr. and Mrs. Sampson Robinson, was found dead of sniper fire on September 11, 1969, in Vietnam.

Marvin had served in the Army since October 9, 1966 taking his Basic Training at Ft. Polk, La. He served one year in Germany, then going to Vietnam in April, 1969.

Marvin Ray came from an old and honorable Indian family known for their leadership in the Coushatta Tribe, his parents having come to the Coushatta Territory in 1923. He was born at the Indian village, grew up there, attended school and graduated from Big Sandy High School. He was attending Lamar Tech College at Beaumont, Texas when entering the service of his country. He was a member of the First Texas Indian Baptist Church at the Reservation.

Marvin Ray was an only son of Mr. and Mrs. Sampson Robinson of the Indian Village. Besides his parents he is survived by one sister, Wynema Kay Robinson, paternal grandmother, Mrs. Lizzie Robinson, Elton, La., maternal grandmother, Mrs. Phoebe Celestine of the Village. Several aunts, uncles and cousins in Elton, La., Indian Village at Livingston, Texas and Houston, Texas.

The remains will arrive Sept. 22 and will lie in state at the First Texas Indian Baptist Church at Indian Village with civilian rites and full military honors at 10 a.m. Sept. 23, then with military escort and final military honors and last rites at the Veterans National Cemetery at 10410 Stubener-Airline, Houston, Texas, at 1 p.m., Sept. 23.

He is missed by and grieved for by the many Indian people who knew and loved him. Yet these same people are proud to know he gave his life that this world may soon know peace and in fighting side by side, the white man may walk in unity and Christian love with the Red Man and all races of our world.

Funeral arrangements by Edwards Funeral Home, Woodville, Texas.

IRA NOEL GABRIELSON 80TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, September 27, marks the 80th birthday of a great American and a great conservationist, a man who has devoted more than a half-century to maintaining America's natural beauty and habitable environment.

I refer to Ira Noel Gabrielson, the dean of American conservationists, whom I have known and counted among my friends since the days of my youth.

Dr. Gabrielson is equally well known to all of my colleagues who have had anything to do with conservation issues. Many of us, on some occasion, have

sought his counsel and have received quick, positive and accurate answers delivered in an authoritative manner spiced with an earthy humor.

Few men have been more a living part of the conservation movement than Ira Gabrielson. He was born in Sioux Rapids, Iowa, in 1889, and graduated from Morningside College with a degree in biology. In 1915, after 3 years as a high school teacher in biology, he joined the staff of the old Bureau of Biological Survey in the Department of Agriculture.

In his capacity as a biologist, he engaged in a wide variety of activities, from studies of economic ornithology to predator and rodent control and game management.

Within a few years he had attained national recognition as one of the leading authorities in Federal service on the birds, mammals, and plants of the West. By 1931, he had been promoted to regional supervisor of predator and rodent control in charge of all Federal game management activities in the Northwest. In 1935, Jan N. "Ding" Darling, the Chief of the Bureau of Biological Survey brought him to Washington as assistant chief of the Division of Wildlife Research. Dr. Gabrielson became Chief of the Bureau on Darling's retirement in November of the same year.

He became the first Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in 1940 when the new agency was formed by combining the Biological Survey and the Bureau of Fisheries in the Department of the Interior. Much of our great system of national wildlife refuges was built under his supervision. During World War II he served as a Deputy Coordinator of Fisheries, and in this capacity was responsible for developing and sustaining the production of marine sea foods essential to the conduct of the war. He was a delegate to the International Whaling Conference in 1946.

Dr. Gabrielson resigned from Federal service in 1946 to accept the presidency of the Wildlife Management Institute. He has served continuously and energetically in that position since that time.

He has been a member or officer of many governmental committees and citizens' conservation groups. He served on the advisory committee of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. He was secretary of the Secretary of the Interior's Advisory Committee for many years, embracing at least three administrations. His work as president of the World Wildlife Fund since its founding has brought him international acclaim.

State as well as Federal administrators and legislators have sought his advice. Since 1950, he has directed staff studies of the organization and operations of the wildlife departments in 32 States and two Canadian Provinces. He is author of four authoritative books on conservation and ornithology and has coauthored three others. In 1964 he was the recipient of the Conservation Service Award of the Department of the Interior. He received the Distinguished Service Medal of the Department of the Interior in 1948, the Audubon Medal of the National Audubon Society in 1949, the Aldo Leopold Medal of the Wildlife Society in 1953, and the

Distinguished Service Award of the American Forestry Association in 1962. He has received honorary degrees of doctor of science from three colleges.

Mr. Speaker, at 80 years of age Ira Gabrielson continues to be a proud and resourceful servant of mankind. His selfless devotion to the preservation and enhancement of our natural heritage is deserving of our full praise.

LEGISLATION TO PERMIT VOLUNTARY PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, Bible reading and prayer in public schools have been banned by the Supreme Court.

This same Court which sees great danger to the Republic if schoolchildren recite a morning prayer, has turned loose a veritable flood of pornography on the American public through a series of incredible judicial decisions which have reversed numerous pornographic convictions by State courts.

It is not difficult to see why the Supreme Court has drawn heavy criticism when it renders decisions which permit unscrupulous publishers to poison our youth with pornography of every description, yet deem it unconstitutional for a morning prayer to be spoken in a public school classroom.

I have introduced legislation—House Joint Resolution 79—which would amend the Constitution to permit voluntary prayer in public schools.

Until such legislation is passed, however, children are denied the recitation of voluntary, nonsectarian prayer at the start of their school day.

One means of continuing this desirable practice has been originated in a New Jersey school district where the children use the daily prayer of the House and Senate Chaplains of the U.S. Congress as their daily prayer.

Even the Supreme Court has not had the temerity to question Congress right to open its sessions with a prayer, and the school administration at Netcong, N.J., believes that if Congress can start its work with a prayer, so can public schools, the Supreme Court notwithstanding.

I quite agree with the position of the New Jersey school jurisdiction and to aid these folks and others who have the same problem, I plan to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a number of children's prayers suitable for recitation at the start of the school day.

These prayers can then be read from the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of the official business of Congress without interference from the Supreme Court:

THIS WEEK'S PRAYERS

I

He prayeth best, who loveth best
All things both great and small;
For the dear God who loveth us,
He made and loveth all.

—Samuel Taylor Coleridge.

II

Be my guide, O Lord, I pray,
Lest I stumble on my way.
Be my strength, dear Lord, I ask,
That I may fulfill each task.
Be my light, that I may see
What Thou dost require of me.
Keep me, Lord, both day and night,
Pure and sinless in Thy sight.
—Elfreida Wightman.

III

O Lord, open my eyes, to see
What is beautiful;
My mind, to know what is true,
My heart, to love what is good.

IV

Lord, our hearts to Thee we raise
In songs of thankfulness and praise.
Bless us, Lord, and grant that we
Good and true and brave may be.

V

Teach me, my God and King,
In all things Thee to see,
That what I do in anything,
To do it as for Thee.

—George Herbert.

GOD HELP US

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, with all the dissatisfaction and dissent among many of our young people in the world today, resulting in terrifying clashes in our schools and elsewhere, I am truly pleased and gratified that a 15-year-old youngster from Savannah, Ga., presently residing in the Washington area, is more concerned with positive literary creation than with creating or participating in student unrest.

This young man is Peter Anestos, the son of my good friends and constituents, Mr. and Mrs. Harry Anestos.

There is little doubt in my mind that with further maturity and continued zest for expressing his own thoughts in prose, he will advance to the ranks of writing nobility and may indeed bring fame and, hopefully, fortune to himself during his lifetime.

I bring to the attention of my colleagues Peter's story, "God Help Us," and I am sure you will share my pride with his admirable writing skills.

[From the Savannah News-Press magazine, Aug. 17, 1969]

GOD HELP US

(By Peter Anestos)

(NOTE.—The author is the 15-year-old son of Harry Anestos, a Washington attorney who formerly practiced law in Savannah. His Napoleonic war vignette was written as a classroom assignment.)

I was freezing, weakening. And we were retreating, indeed fleeing. The Grande Armee of Napoleon Bonaparte, fleeing. We had invaded Russia, but at Moscow our strength had been spent. The snows were coming, and we all had hoped Napoleon would lead us southward against British India, where the climate is just right for fighting. After all, this is what he had promised us back in Königsberg. And how could the Emperor not keep his promise?

Nevertheless, we turned around, exhausted and run down. Even my good friend Armarde

veteran of Austerlitz and Jena, was unusually frail and weak when we left Moscow.

It was difficult for me to understand why the Emperor ordered retreat. What were we retreating before? The Russians? Preposterous! I pondered over the decision to pull back. Still it failed to explain itself.

Soon I began to understand. For no sooner had we departed the Moskva Valley than the snow and the temperature began to fall.

Before the end of a week, soldiers were dropping from the tanks, frozen stiff. There were no more shiny epaulets, or dashing of officers barking commands, but simply the ubiquitous groan of the dying.

After a while the cold had penetrated my head as well as my overcoat.

"Armande, Armande!" I screamed, when driven by the cold into hysteria. The old soldier merely stared, pityingly.

Soon thoughts drifted into my mind. They generated into vocal exclamations.

"I am but eighteen! Why should the good Lord will that I should die before I have yet lived!" I sobbed in despair.

"Quiet, dear Andre," Armande commanded, with a firmness mingled with sympathy.

"But look what has happened, Armande! We triumphed and we conquered! Yet we flee! Why? No one drives us away, except perhaps God—Armande! If God is our enemy, death will surely be our fate! For no one, not even the Emperor's Old Guard can defeat Him! Oh, Armande!"

At this point Armande struck me back to my senses. "Control yourself, dear Andre! You know I love you as though you were my own son! I beg you, please do not torment me with sorrow—Please!" I recognized a tear collecting on his aged and bearded face.

We marched. We marched and kept on marching. And I knew we were marching into further oblivion. For the brunt of the cold had yet to come.

I consoled myself by thinking of home, back in Dijon. I dreamed of Annette, "ma petite princesse" as I used to call her.

Her beautiful face flanked by those graceful blonde locks of hair filled me with a warmth that not even the Russian cold could suppress. "Annette, my belle Annette!" I moaned. But every time the violent wind blew, it carried the image of Annette with it.

The subzero cold was breaking me.

That part of me that was not yet frost-bitten resisted admirably but futilely.

After hours of marching my legs started to crumble beneath me. My arm simply hung beside me. I managed to support myself on Armande's weak, but firm frame.

A terrifying shriek shattered the long, sickening groan of the wounded—"Cossacks!" "Prepare yourself, monami," urged Armande, with a complacency characterized by his many experiences of the past.

"Yes," I said, respectfully obedient.

All of a sudden a Cossack galloped toward me. I raised my sabre, prepared to defend myself. The horseman, spotting my sabre, avoided a clash by drawing his pistol.

I heard a clap of gun powder, followed by a sharp pang in my chest. With a last ounce of strength I screamed; and all went black.

I was awakened by the harsh jolt of an ambulance cart in which I had been placed. I felt the stabbing throb of my wound coupled with the never-ending cold. The tremulousness of the cart only increased my torment.

I had become so weak from frostbite and loss of blood that I anticipated death before the arrival of the morrow. But the next day still found me living—still found me suffering. I would moan with both pain and despair, but God never seemed generous enough to lower his thumb.

Miles upon miles of suffering passed. But suddenly the days became warmer, the land-

scape greener. Then I realized that the cold of Russia had given way to the warmth of Prussia.

I had survived that terrible fiasco in Russia. But I shuddered as I recalled the sight of my dear comrades collapsing everywhere I turned. I later learned that Armande had died of frostbite, increasing my sorrow. But as I lamented these tragedies, I came to understand what war really is. And I began to realize that if we, as men of our own free will, cannot overcome this horrible proclivity, then only God can help us.

THE OFFSHORE WEATHER GAP

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the lack of accurate hurricane tracking methods is a matter of serious concern to my district, and indeed to residents of seaside towns all along the Atlantic coast.

Within the last 2 weeks, we have all seen the problems that result from such a lack. Millions of dollars were lost to the New England economy, through closed factories, closed schools, and unneeded civil defense preparations—all due to a faulty projection of where hurricane Gerda would hit.

This is not a new problem. Some years ago, when a storm hit the coast when it was not expected—instead of not hitting where it was expected, as in this case—I had the opportunity to discuss the situation with many experts in the field.

It was agreed then, as now, that a weather ship in the North Atlantic would solve the forecasting problem.

WBZ-TV in Boston has been aware of this problem, and has been vigorously supporting efforts to have such a weather ship. They recently broadcast two editorials on the subject, which succinctly sum up the need for such a ship.

The editorials follow:

THE OFFSHORE WEATHER GAP

(Delivered by L. L. Thompson, area vice president, WBZ/WBZ-TV; Winthrop P. Baker, general manager, WBZ-TV)

The hurricane season has started. And people along the New England coast are taking the weather and its forecasting a lot more seriously than usual. We think this sea and sky watch should put some added steam into the campaign to close a major gap in our area forecasting facilities.

At the present time there are no weather ships or even buoys stationed in that huge stretch of ocean below New England which is so crucial to keeping tabs on coastal storms. This offshore weather blackout has been bothering our WBZ meteorologists for a long time. The present weakness showed up plainly last winter when those extended snow storms kept everyone guessing.

WBZ-TV newsman Peter Mehegan has just done a series on this offshore weather gap. The area has been promised better aerial reconnaissance of storms this season. But Commerce Department officials in Washington want to hold off another year on providing funds for a weather ship. And a ship is far and away the best vehicle for providing accurate weather information on a continuing basis.

Sen. Edward Brooke has taken the lead in trying to get the money for the weather ship

appropriated this year. He will take his case before the Senate Appropriations Committee next month. If he doesn't win there, he'll move to have the funds included in the budget on the Senate floor. This will be an uphill fight, and his chances of success will be better if he has indications of real popular support. These should come not just from people in Massachusetts but all along the coast from New Jersey northward. The message to Congress should be plain. The weather ship is needed. And there's no excuse for any more delay in getting it on station.

THAT WEATHER GAP AGAIN

(Delivered by Jim Lightfoot, general manager, WBZ Radio; Winthrop P. Baker, general manager, WBZ-TV)

Hurricane Gerda has huffed and puffed her way eastward into the Atlantic. She's no longer a threat to New England. And for that everyone along the coast can be grateful. Amid the sighs of relief, though, we'd like to utter another strong plea for the Weather Bureau to fill that offshore weather gap south of Cape Cod.

As we and our WBZ meteorologists have been pointing out, there are no weather ships or even buoys stationed in that huge stretch of ocean below New England. It was the void of information from that area which kept forecasters from having accurate information on this storm through the morning hours. As a result there was a lot of needless excitement and worry, unnecessary school, office and business closings.

The Weather Bureau has promised such a weather ship in the future, but they want to hold off another whole year in providing the funds for it. In the interim they've tried to pacify the area with expanded aerial reconnaissance. But the experience with Gerda shows plainly that's not enough. The plane sent out to chart the hurricane's path had to turn back due to air turbulence. The weather ship is the answer.

The government justifies the delay in providing the weather ship because of the shortage of government funds. But we wonder how much money has been wasted in this storm with those needless storm precautions, those school, office and plant closings.

The Senate battle for the weather ship funds is still coming up. Sen. Edward Brooke will be leading the fight. He needs all the help he can get from all over New England. Let's get that ship on station by the next hurricane season.

THE FISCAL KNIFE ON NIH RESEARCH

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker. May God forgive.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 16, 1969]

THE FISCAL KNIFE ON NIH RESEARCH

The fiscal knife which the administration says it is forced to wield because of inflation and Vietnam cut into medical research last week. Taking its place among the agencies whose funds are either being cut or pared by President Nixon's call for a \$3.5 billion reduction in 1970 budget requests is the National Institutes of Health. Total spending on medical research—in hospitals, universities and the NIH Bethesda labs—will be down from \$1.93 billion to \$1.64 billion, a cut of \$290 million.

Although medical and scientific researchers are often inclined to be a wolf! wolf! crowd whose sheep are not only under no attack

but are often overfat to begin with, the abruptness of the present NIH cut does suggest that a wolf is near. Most immediately affected by the cut will be 19 clinical research centers. In a style similar to its closing of 59 Job Corps centers earlier this year, the administration expects to save money. But savings aside, where will the doctors go who have been conducting the research at the 19 centers? What about the diseased patients who will be phased out because money has run out? Or the millions of future sick people who will not benefit tomorrow because research into their particular disease was cut off today? In one area alone, an estimated 30,000 infants die every year in the period immediately surrounding delivery because basic research is not fully advanced in this area.

Aside from the research that is to be stopped without waiting for results, medical schools—with a heavy leaning on the government for research grants—will also be hit, both students and faculty. The danger of turning off the medical research motor is that it is not so easily started again. It is true, the 19 centers to be closed have only a handful of patients, but this is where basic biomedical research begins. It then fans out to advance research and, often, eventual use in the medical community.

It has long been a question whether medical schools and research clinics should have let themselves become so dependent on federal funds in the first place; but few other resources exist, either among foundations, which generally do not support medical research, or the drug companies, which by the nature of things are in the business more for profit than public service.

Although the Senate can appropriate more money for NIH than the administration requests, this does not mean the administration must or will spend it. Aside from the medical research programs themselves, what suffers also in this abrupt fund cut is the administration's sincerity in facing the health crisis. "The nation is faced with a breakdown in the delivery of health care," it said only two months ago in a major White House report. Now, it seems, in order to save money that could be saved in, say, cutting back on aircraft carriers or bombers, the administration is helping, not relieving, the breakdown. In putting the fiscal knife to medical research, the recovery may take a lot longer than the original cutting.

STUDYING THE PROBLEMS OF LAKE ERIE

HON. JOSEPH P. VIGORITO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, the number of Federal, State, and local agencies who are delving into the problems of environmental pollution are numerous. It is good to know that so many citizens are sufficiently worried about our environment that they are dedicating their lives to finding an answer to the problems we face.

It is especially rewarding to learn that our young people are becoming involved in this fight to combat air and water pollution. Erie, Pa., is vitally involved since it has an intimate stake in preserving Lake Erie. I was, therefore extremely glad to learn of the work being undertaken at Gannon College in Erie by students and faculty members on the ecology of Lake Erie.

So that my colleagues may become more aware of this project, I insert in the RECORD the following short article from the latest issue of the Gannon College Record.

AN ECOLOGICAL SURVEY OF LAKE ERIE

Gannon College, under the direction of Reverend Austin J. O'Toole and Mr. Stanley J. Zagorski of the Biology Department, has begun an Ecological Survey of Lake Erie. Supported by a grant received from the Pennsylvania Science and Engineering Foundation, the survey is directed at obtaining scientific knowledge of the Lake outlining the city of Erie.

During the fall of 1968 Mr. Zagorski and Reverend O'Toole met with Hammermill Paper Co. officials and from these meetings the following objectives would be sought:

1. To increase biological and chemical knowledge of the portion of Lake Erie surrounding the city of Erie.
2. To establish a co-operative program between Gannon College and the Hammermill Paper Co. for the purpose of conserving the natural resources of Lake Erie.
3. To contribute as best as possible to the development of Lake Erie as a source of enjoyment for the people of northwestern Pennsylvania.
4. To train students in the methods of water biology.
5. To enable industry to further advance the preservation of our resources.
6. To enable Gannon College to be of service to the community in scientific research.

In order to achieve these objectives, a proposal was written and submitted to the newly formed Lakes Research Institute of Erie, Pa. Mr. Frederick D. Buggle, President of the G.L.R.I., has stated that the purpose of this institute is to become involved in scientific research leading to the preservation and development of Lake Erie. A further purpose of this institute is to coordinate the efforts of industry and universities located on the Great Lakes in their attempts to solve the problems of the Lakes. The Gannon College-Hammermill proposal was submitted to the Great Lakes Research Institute which received the grant funds from the P.S.E.F. Through the efforts of the Great Lakes Research Institute, Gannon College was awarded a grant of \$21,000.

Work was begun in March, 1969 and will continue until December, 1969. Scientific investigation of Lake Erie involves the following procedure:

1. Every 10-14 days water samples are obtained from five areas of Lake Erie. These areas are:

- (a) Walnut Creek
- (b) Presque Isle Peninsula
- (c) Bay Area
- (d) City effluent and Hammermill Area
- (e) Shade's Beach

In each area four stations are visited. Samples are collected on the surface and vertically at each meter.

2. At each sampling station, Oxygen determinations are made. Light penetration readings are also obtained.

3. Chemical determinations of Nitrogen Phosphate and Sulfate are made at Hammermill.

4. In the Gannon College Laboratory all water samples are carefully analyzed microscopically and all living organisms are identified. Approximately 150 samples are observed weekly.

Mr. Zagorski and Reverend O'Toole have the help of the Biology students of Gannon in the project. Approximately 10 biology students are directly involved in the Lake Erie Program. This is the first time a project of this dimension has been undertaken by the scientists of Gannon College. The knowledge and training of our students is of primary importance, Reverend O'Toole and Mr. Zagorski point out.

It is felt that projects such as this are of value because:

1. Gannon College will grow scientifically through co-operative projects with industry.
2. The G.L.R.I. (Great Lakes Research Institute) will expand because of the increased efforts to unify industries and universities.
3. Industries will be looked upon as supporters of conservation projects for Lake Erie.

Hopefully the project now underway is the first of many scientific endeavors in attempts to increase community co-operation in scientific investigation.

SARKES AND MARY TARZIAN: WHERE BUT IN AMERICA?

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago an Armenian immigrant named Sarkes Tarzian began a small factory in Bloomington, Ind., with only 10 employees, doing consulting engineering and making air trimmer condensers. The ensuing 25 years have been exciting and productive ones for Sarkes Tarzian and his wife, Mary, who is of Armenian descent but was born in this country. And, also, for the six-county community in south-central Indiana, comprising the counties of Monroe, Brown, Owen, Morgan, Greene, and Lawrence, that has furnished co-workers, customers, suppliers, and just plain friends and neighbors.

Today the Tarzian enterprise has grown to employ 2,000 people, including a semiconductor division, a tuner division making more TV tuners than any other company in the Nation; a broadcast division with TV stations in Fort Wayne and Bloomington and Indianapolis; FM and AM radio stations in Bloomington, Indianapolis, and Fort Wayne; a broadcast equipment division that makes cameras and other components for the broadcast industry; a magnetic tape division; and daily newspapers in Bloomington and Greencastle, a weekly in Martinsville, plus Six-County Topics, a regional paper covering the six counties listed above.

To observe the silver anniversary, and also to say "Thank you" to the people in the area who have helped make it possible, a gala Sarkes Tarzian special, free to the public and serving as the kickoff to the yearlong 25th anniversary celebration, was held on Saturday, September 6, 1969, at the new Indiana University Fieldhouse in Bloomington. Featuring the popular country and western singing star, Jimmy Dean, the shows and the picnic lunches preceding them were free to all. A total of 15,000 attended.

Products of the Tarzian factories—which in turn to a great degree are products of the inventive, innovative, and inquiring mind of Sarkes Tarzian himself—are known all over the world, in the fields of radio, television, and general electronics, but primarily in television. Known all over the world, yes, but produced in south-central Indiana, in the region that became "home" to an Armenian immigrant boy and his wife, and it was to the people of this region, in the

heartland of the American Republic, that Sarkes and Mary Tarzian turned. The mutual trust and confidence shown by all in the past 25 years has been fulfilled and rewarded many, many times over. Today the Tarzians are leaders in the industrial, economic, social, and local cultural life of Indiana.

The epic of Sarkes and Mary Tarzian and of all who worked with them to make all of this possible is in the highest and finest tradition of fulfillment of the American dream. The generous and open-hearted "Thank you" is a gesture that is unfortunately all too seldom found today. Both these aspects to the story stand as a solid rebuttal to those forces, within and without our country, who attack and would destroy all the Republic stands for, and, more yet, as a glittering, worldwide example of what our people, working together in trust and harmony, can, and will, do.

GENERAL HERSHEY AND THE DRAFT

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as we know Secretary Laird has indicated the administration's intention to move toward reform of certain aspects of the Selective Service System. While those of us who have advocated extensive draft reform applied this decision, we feel that much more can be done and should be done and I intend to speak out on this subject in due course. In the meantime, I share the dismay expressed recently by the Armed Forces Journal at the administration's decision to retain the present Director of the Selective Service System in office. We are all mindful of the long and honorable service which General Hershey has rendered the country. Nevertheless, it is my considered opinion that it is time the country recognizes that service in some suitable fashion and sends the general to a well-deserved retirement. I take the liberty of placing before the House the following editorial from the Armed Forces Journal:

GENERAL HERSHEY AND THE DRAFT

By some estimates, more than 5,000 American youngsters have now exiled themselves, presumably for life, to avoid the draft. Their view of military service is in startling contrast to that once expressed by General George S. Patton, Jr.:

"The highest obligation and privilege of citizenship is that of bearing arms for one's country."

Revision of the Selective Service System justifiably ranks among the new Administration's highest priorities. The present system is not just. In order to draft 300,000 men a year, the system keeps five million young men in a state of uncertainty and insecurity for the seven most critical years of their lives.

Little wonder that so many youngsters—and their families—bitterly question a system in which 4,000 local draft boards act by their own interpretations of today's draft laws. Selective Service guidelines vary as to

when an individual may be called for service, as well as to whom shall be called. Simply to find out what his rights of appeal are, a registrant has to hire his own attorney.

Despite Congressional assurances two years ago that hearings would be held on draft reform, there have been no such hearings in either House. The Administration, we are told, had to "coax like crazy" simply to get its modest new draft bill introduced.

The Pentagon's current proposal for random selection of 19-year-olds is a salutary step forward. But something's wrong when a Congress sworn to represent the people has to defer to Pentagon initiatives to stave off a public rebellion over draft laws that are ambiguous and archaic. Something's wrong when the initiative has to come from the Pentagon, because it hasn't come from the guy in charge—Selective Service Director Gen. Lewis B. Hershey.

General Hershey, now 76, has given his country long and distinguished service. In years past, he has been an outstanding Administrator. But now, as never before, the Selective Service System needs the public's support. Clearly, General Hershey no longer has it.

We were, therefore, shocked by the White House announcement on Tuesday that "There are absolutely no plans whatsoever to replace General Hershey."

In the past, the Journal too has staunchly supported General Hershey. But it's time for a change.

The Selective Service System needs a Director in the front office, not a monument. It needs a leader who will take the initiatives General Hershey hasn't.

The youngsters of this country who face military service deserve better leadership. And the Services deserve better help in their search for just, innovative, meaningful draft reforms; in their fight to regain the public trust; in their work to instill the pride of Service that General Patton so aptly expressed.

It's time for General Hershey to step down, while he still can do so with dignity.

BENJAMIN F. SCHEMMER.

GENOCIDE—MORE WAYS THAN ONE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, genocide is abhorred universally. Unfortunately, many feel genocide is limited to the killing of members of a race and do not fully understand the several methods by which genocide can be inflicted.

Varied methods of genocide have been used in the Soviet Union by that regime. Soviet Russia embarked on a subtle program of genocide in efforts to achieve a solution to their troublesome minorities problem. In Russia the primary reason for failure to have achieved their proclaimed national goal of racial equality and minorities balance was attributed to group pride of the minorities and their stubborn resistance to Socialist programs of the Communist Party in power.

To overcome the problems encountered in reaching their egalitarian goal the Communists instituted such forceful programs as busing, resettlement, relocation, and population quotas—which genocidal techniques were justified by the Bolsheviks as necessary reforms for economic and social progress.

Lurking behind the seductive mask of

the announced goal of the "fully integrated society" in the United States is the inescapable threat of similar genocidal activities ultimately being employed. Any governmental policies utilizing power or implied force to impose a percentage of racial and minorities balance must necessarily destroy, in whole or in part, national, racial, ethnical, and religious minorities as it moves to level all groups to a common denominator.

News accounts daily show an increase in school disturbances, union disorders, and outbreaks of violence in other areas of our society normally peaceful.

Yet, the American people, who would never tolerate or condone genocide, have not recognized that many of the current disorders are but the natural and spontaneous reactions by groups of innocent people to their instinctive perception of the impending danger from genocidal acts which inevitably accompany the establishment of any planned environment or community made a reality by force.

Apparently some of the more ancient and cohesive cultures of the world have a more profound comprehension that there are other ways to destroy a people than the mere physical destruction of individuals in one generation of the group. For this reason, and to protect themselves and their posterity, from devious or more subtle genocidal measures they have felt constrained to enact and ratify a convention which outlaws genocide in every form. See full text of the Genocide Treaty contained in my remarks September 16, 1969, at page 25703.

Mr. Speaker, several current news accounts follow:

WHY NOT ABANDON COMPULSORY CONGREGATION?

(By Russell Kirk)

At a time when the Nixon Administration must deal decisively with great issues in foreign policy, fiscal problems and urban confusion, infinite time is spent by federal people in trying to run school districts throughout the land.

North and South, officials of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and federal judges, issue bewildering decisions regarding racial integration in schools, busing, and all that. Meanwhile, tempers grow hotter in every school district affected, and standards of instruction and discipline decline ruinously.

Consider the second city of Michigan, Grand Rapids. A general boycott by students is demanded by opponents of "compulsory congregation"—that is, of total integration by school bus, regardless of the wishes of parents or the practical consequences to schools or neighborhood patterns. The more violent opponents to this integration plan are said to threaten to burn down the churches of ministers who do not favor the strike, and to menace physically anyone who speaks out against them.

Who are these "segregationists" ardent to retain the established neighborhood-school pattern? Ku Klux Klan? Oh, no: they're the black militants, who would have all Negro children withdraw from school, to show the school board their power.

But the protesters are not militants only. A great many more moderate colored people oppose integration by bus, believing that it would handicap their children. And also there is fierce opposition from white neighborhoods. Three school-board members were elected recently on a platform of "no busing."

Pity the Grand Rapids Board of Education. If that board's members persist in busing "inner city" children to schools on the fringe, they will invite total disorder in the schools; the mere beginning of this policy, during the past year, brought chaos into schools previously tranquil. But if they abandon the policy, they fear that a federal court will order them to resume it, regardless of consequences. (Actually, there is no court directive compelling busing in Grand Rapids, at present.)

Grand Rapids' conundrum is experienced by virtually every big city in the country, in some degree. And the chief sufferers are school children.

Much of the difficulty, reflected in decisions of federal courts and in policies of HEW, is this: a confounding of "desegregation" with "compulsory congregation." Desegregation means that no one should be denied educational opportunity because of race: Public schools restricted to one race are in violation of the Constitution.

But compulsory congregation means that there must be total racial integration in public schools, whether the people most intimately concerned like it or not; it is an attempt to use public schools as a leveling sociological laboratory.

No Supreme Court decision ever has decreed compulsory congregation through busing and similar methods, though some inferior federal judges act as if they had such authorization.

Now suppose—as in Grand Rapids—that a large part of the Negro population doesn't desire compulsory congregation; suppose they prefer neighborhood schools; suppose they resent the whole notion of total integration now, believing it reflects the belief of white liberals that the Negro is a constitutional inferior, who can be improved only by being submerged in a crowd of white people.

Well, then: for whose benefit is this total integration intended? Are the white urban neighborhoods and suburbs desperately eager for it? Why persist in a policy that makes the task of schooling infinitely more difficult for everybody?

Grand Rapids educationists are promoting a panacea already nominally adopted—and already tacitly abandoned—in Pittsburgh and Chicago: creation of a gigantic "educational park" to which all high school pupils would be transported by bus. It's an abstract and nonsensical scheme: if high schools are difficult to control on their present scale, one would encounter real anarchy and depersonalization in the "educational park." And why should merely jamming all young people on one campus produce racial amity?

Probably the remedies must come from more sensible policies in HEW and clarifying, moderate decisions by the reconstituted Supreme Court, under Chief Justice Burger. Education, like politics is the art of the possible. To rouse hatred in the name of equality is consummate folly, especially in schools.

The only tolerable settlement that this commentator can discern would be something as follows:

Insure that children of "ethnic minorities" can attend the schools in their own neighborhood, even if those schools are predominantly white; and may be transported to other schools if that clearly would be to their advantage, and if their parents desire it.

Abandon doctrinaire attempts at compulsory congregation; accept the natural neighborhood school pattern; and work hard to improve those neighborhood schools that, for whatever reason, seem inferior.

For the purpose of a public school is not to transform society, but to teach children.

[From the Evening Star, Sept. 24, 1969]
UNIONS THREATEN BOYCOTT OVER RACIAL QUOTA PLAN

ATLANTIC CITY, N.J.—Angry union leaders, today threatened a boycott of federal construction projects to protest a government

plan they said would set racial hiring quotas. "It's going to raise the roof," said one AFL-CIO building trades leader after the Labor Department announced it would go ahead with the controversial Philadelphia plan.

Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz said in Washington yesterday the plan would be put into effect in Philadelphia and expanded nationwide as soon as possible to insure more high-paying construction jobs for Negroes and other minority groups.

The plan would require contractors on federal projects of \$50,000 or more to hire a certain number from minority groups for iron work, plumbing, pipefitting, sheet metal and electricians jobs.

NUMBER DISPUTED

Shultz has said Negro workers in those trades in the Philadelphia area amount to less than two per cent, but the unions claim about 12 per cent.

Leaders of the AFL-CIO Construction and Building Trades Department, who earlier said they would throw open their doors to all qualified minority group journeymen, prepared resolutions denouncing the Philadelphia plan as "infamous" and a "union-busting" tactic.

AFL-CIO President George Meany, scheduled to speak today to the convention of the 17 construction unions, reportedly will join in the opposition to the government plan and warn against black militant attempts to frighten the unions into taking in untrained Negroes.

One resolution proposed that "the Building and Construction Trades Department use all the power and persuasiveness at its means to defeat this plan, to the point and including the withholding of all manpower from any federal project perpetuating this plan."

DELEGATE ACTION TODAY

The final form of the resolution to be acted on today by delegates representing 3.5 million construction workers was still in preparation.

But a union source said Shultz' announcement that he would go ahead with the Philadelphia plan is likely to make union opposition even stronger.

The construction union leaders argue the plan is illegal under the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which outlawed racial employment quotas.

The plan had been blocked a year ago by claims of the controller general and the General Accounting Office it was illegal. But Atty. Gen. John N. Mitchell, in an opinion requested by Shultz, rejected that idea.

"The revised Philadelphia Plan is legal," Mitchell stated yesterday.

The controller general and the GAO claimed it, violated the very civil rights law it was intended to further by establishing racial "quotas."

Mitchell, however, agreed with Shultz it does not have that effect.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Sept. 24, 1969]

SCATTERED VIOLENCE HITS SCHOOLS, CONSTRUCTION

Demonstrations centering around schools and construction projects flared into violence yesterday in Riverside, Calif.; Detroit, Chicago, Seattle, Wash.; New Brunswick, N.J., and in New York City's Harlem.

Two students were arrested and six others suffered minor injuries in a racial disturbance at Rubidoux High School in Riverside, Calif. Scattered fighting broke out in the cafeteria during the lunch period and one store window and six car windshields were broken after school.

Three consecutive days of disturbances at Detroit inner city high schools culminated in a brief confrontation between black students and police. Some 30 policemen used nightsticks to disperse rock and bottle-throwing youths at one high school and a junior high was forced to close when 50 youths bombarded it with missiles.

FIVE HURT IN CHICAGO

Five persons, including three policemen, were injured yesterday in the second day of racial violence at Austin High School on Chicago's West Side. None of the injuries were serious. Police arrested 24 youths, most of them reported to be members of the Vice Lords street gang.

At the Seattle campus of the University of Washington, 12 persons were arrested when demonstrators attempted to stop construction work until more black trainees were hired. Two trucks and a bulldozer were pushed into a 30-foot construction pit and three workers were roughed up, authorities said.

Two New Brunswick High School students were arrested and classes were canceled at noon after flareups of violence. Officials said liability insurance for the system's 11 schools has been canceled because of sporadic racial disorders. Four students were injured during a boycott last week.

SCUFFLE IN HARLEM

Fifty black demonstrators scuffled with police yesterday across the street from the site of a new state office building in Harlem. The demonstrators, who have camped on the site they want used for a school or housing, have delayed the start of construction for three months.

In Clarksdale, Miss., Negro high school students said they would continue demonstrations at Clarksdale high school despite the arrest of 142 students yesterday. The peaceful demonstration was to protest alleged segregation at the school.

Eleven Indians were arrested yesterday when they attempted to enroll their children in a Ridgeville, S.C., elementary school already containing white and Negro children. They were charged with "disturbing a school."

[From the Manchester Union Leader, Sept. 23, 1969]

PITY THE POOR SCHOOL BOARDS (By Lewis Seale)

A vise of intolerable power now grips the Southern school boards. They are caught between the federal courts—HEW on the one side dictating "not education, but integration first," and the parents of the children involved. The directives grow sillier with every issue of paper and decree. Demands are made that certain schools be closed, that new ones be built in other localities, that some be enlarged and others not be enlarged. If there is a large percentage of pupils of one race in any one school, they must be bused across not only towns, but in some cases halfway across the county (or in Louisiana where we call them "parishes") to achieve a racial balance.

If the reader is confused, he should live here, or at least visit, because just as surely as we are forced to integrate under those conditions, so will he. Now is the time for the citizenry of this nation to band together against the common enemy—our own oppressive government.

A friend of mine suffered polio in her youth. For many years has been a teacher. She does not own an automobile and, indeed, could not drive one if she did own it. Her foot does not have that good a control. In order to be self-reliant, she bought a home near her school. Guess what? She has been assigned to a school several miles away and, of course, it is located in an almost inaccessible Negro section. Like most of our local people who returned home to teach, she did it with permanency in mind, and bought herself a home at a time when interest rates were half what they are today. If we are to experience what other areas have experienced where white teachers teach in black jungles, then she will be in for a bad time because physically she will be hard put to maintain discipline. Meek, mild little Sadie will have no real peace.

But it is the busing of the pupils themselves which will be the problem. A child six years of age has no real business having to get up early enough to travel thirty miles to school—that is, unless it is absolutely necessary, and making social experiments is no real necessity. Suppose, as the question has arisen, that a child gets sick and needs to be sent home? Who will send him? Who will take him? Can a school be held responsible for their transportation?

Is the entire civil rights area under the domination of over eager integrationists? Is there no restraint upon them? The 1964 Civil Rights—or is it the Civil Wrongs—Law forbade—and it forbade expressly—the busing of pupils. This is not being accepted by either HEW or the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. It must be remembered that these schools were built upon land purchased by bond sales and the schools were themselves built by funds also from these bond sales in areas selected because of the population. These bond sales amount to a second mortgage on the real estate owned in those areas. It should be remembered that those people who own land here face a bleak future if the federal government forbids the use of and in fact demands the closure of schools and in addition requires new school construction merely to achieve racial balance.

Where will it all end? The demand for equality requires mixing not only the races but the poor and not-so-poor. Will it eventually extend to the point of requiring a periodical reassessing of values—the actual theory behind Socialism—of seizing from the affluent and passing their gold to those either less capitalistic or less energetic? Will the Kennedys, Fords, Rockefellers and the other ultra-liberals consent to this scheme of things or are they merely talking from a mouth which has a forked tongue? Are they sincere about the problems of the poor about whom they become so eloquent or do they have a good tax dodge or perhaps are they placed in good position to merely increase their enormous wealth?

Racial mixing is both socialistic and communistic, for their propaganda equates social standing with capitalism. Forty-odd years ago there was evidence that the Communists had a plan for the negro which would eventually divide America whom all nations seem to fear.

The assignment of pupils and teachers as well as other employees to another school or faculty to achieve racial balance is discriminatory within itself. It is as discriminatory to assign for reason of race to achieve the balance as it is to refuse to assign because of race. Is it perhaps zeal on the part of HEW to do this? It is obvious that HEW cares not for education but, indeed, the actual purpose of the cabinet level arm of our government is pure integration. Who is to pay for these buses? Already there is complaint that the states are not getting enough tax money and must go to Washington for the deficit.

In addition, we should stop and review just what the Supreme Court did order back in 1954. It merely forbade discrimination—or segregation—because of race. The Court did not decree integration, it forbade segregation. Eager-beaver bureaucrats ever since have pushed the matter to the point of no return. If there is a return then it will be an explosive one. There is no real evidence that the matter as it stands is popular with the negroes themselves, for they have great fear of many things, of violence, of economic reprisals, of ostracism by the whites, of ridicule and the probability of their children not being able to keep up.

Parents of the white children resist busing their children into negro areas because the schools are often located in inaccessible areas and where, quite often, many bar-rooms are located. Public laws generally keep bars away from churches and schools,

but it takes locally oriented citizens to resist the issuance of permits. For some reason, the negro residents often fail to see that these laws are enforced. The neighborhoods are often composed of very tough people, accustomed to what has been termed "jungle life." The whites fear violence both inside and outside the schools located here, although in the South, they have been generally non-violent. Of late, however, negroes have stoned autos from overpasses, have attacked whites on the streets without reason and in general have pulled nuisance raids. Yet, strangely enough, in the past there have been integrated housing areas where the populace was "salt and pepper," and where there has been a notable lack of trouble. The truth is that there are probably more integrated neighborhoods in New Orleans and Houston than in New York. There are two prospective lawsuits either already filed or about to be filed down here in Louisiana by black parents who object to the busing of their children. They relate that the distance their children will have to be transported is much further than that distance to their own schools; that irreparable damage will be done to them because the school in their neighborhood will be closed, completely closed. No one has yet come up with an answer to the truth that local monies are scarce for building more.

Ironically, when the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals handed down its decision that "there shall be no negro schools, no white schools, just schools," HEW got into the argument and is insisting that schools named after persons, either living or dead, be changed to something more appropriate. In the past, there have been many negro educators who had schools named after them. But, integration is integration and that is that. HEW does not recognize that schools were built in neighborhoods already established and that schools were not built in open fields away from homes in order that neighborhoods be built around the schools. HEW orders appear to defy calm logic and the courts seem to uphold their lack of reason.

Even if the federal government paid for the schools ordered abandoned, it would defy logic, for these monies come from the public trough and government has no money except taxation.

Some unfunny situations appear from time to time on the fringes. One local Negro school has had excellent football teams in the past. Their coach is now crying because he is losing his best and biggest boys to the formerly white schools in the busing swap.

COOLING THE LONG HOT SUMMERS

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the public image of the financial institutions of this country held by the mass of their clients tends to be a rather cold and forbidding one, of bank officers concerned only with statements of profit and loss and utterly detached from the social ferment that seethes outside paneled board rooms and corporate walls. It is an image, I might add, not improved much by interest rates which have now reached a record high of 8½ percent.

It is refreshing, therefore, when the curtain occasionally parts to reveal bankers as human beings after all, and in some instances more actively involved with human want and social injustice than in that image we often cherish of

ourselves. Such an event has been occurring in my home district of Portland, and I think my colleagues will agree with me that when a staid and highly reputable banking institution, the U.S. National Bank of Oregon, makes an outright grant of \$10,000—no strings attached—to a group of young black high school students banded together in something called the Malcolm X Corp., this is highly arresting news indeed. Yet I can assure you that it happened, that it happened not at the point of a gun, and that something more important than mere money was given.

Ten thousand dollars would have been little enough to pay for public relations and good will, and the gesture might have been suspect had it ended there. But the bank lent something more important in its imaginative support of a venture in what is popularly called "Black Capitalism," namely its business acumen and highly personalized human understanding. A bank vice president, no less, was put to work full time for 4½ months in furtherance of the larger goal of finding jobs for one-half million chronically unemployed people by mid-1971.

Young black students of Washington High School who formed the Malcolm X Corp. had access to a board of businessmen, headed by an assistant vice president of the bank, created to give advice and support.

The inspiring story of this bold experiment has been told, and I insert it in the Record. The lighting of this one little candle could have some profound implications for the future of enlightened democratic capitalism, and I unhesitatingly commend the full text to your attention:

COOLING THE LONG HOT SUMMERS

The bitter message, "Burn Baby Burn," scrawled across city walls has awakened most Americans to the depth of their nation's social crisis. One obvious cause of this crisis is chronic unemployment—especially among low-skilled minority groups. For business, social involvement is no longer a matter of choice.

For banks, social involvement is a responsibility. Anyone who has ever taken an introduction to banking course remembers that banks do not exist just to make money; they are here to serve the community as well. Never has the need for such service been more apparent.

Social involvement has come in the form of a businesswide Affirmative Action policy. U.S. National Bank's own, once quiet work in Affirmative Action has suddenly come to public attention because the now-famous grant to the Malcolm X Corporation.

What is Affirmative Action, and how can it help the chronically unemployed? President LeRoy Staver answered these questions and explained that Affirmative Action is a logical extension of the Equal Opportunity policy. "Equal Opportunity for employment means that no job applicant will be turned away because of color, creed, nationality, or sex," he said. "This is a legal obligation of all business, but we want to do more than our legal obligation. We have to face the problem that not everyone has equal skills, and Equal Opportunity is not the answer for the person who is denied employment because he is unskilled or uneducated.

"Affirmative Action is a policy adopted by our nation's businessmen to help train and qualify these people for our jobs," Mr. Staver explained. "We are prepared to do this be-

cause we believe the poverty and social upheaval resulting from chronic unemployment is the most critical domestic problem facing our country.

"We at U.S. National Bank are very much aware of our responsibility to our community—whether it is to our cities, our state, or our nation. We have a written policy which states we will 'implement affirmatively equal opportunity to all qualified employees and applicants for employment without regard to race, creed, color, sex, or national origin, and positive action shall be taken to ensure fulfillment of this policy.' This policy is consistent with the objectives set forth by the Presidential Executive Order 11246. However," Mr. Staver added, "we wish to do more than observe the letter of the law; it is our intent to honor its spirit. This is what we hope our Affirmative Action program will accomplish."

There are several ways this Affirmative Action program has been implemented at the Bank. One way has been the Bank's participation in the National Alliance of Businessmen, a nationwide organization seeking to find jobs for the hard core unemployed in American metropolitan areas. The Portland-Vancouver area is one of the 50 metropolitan areas selected.

This year, the Bank lent John Mills, vice president in Urban Affairs, to work full time for four-and-a-half months as director of NAB's Job Procurement. Don Crouch, assistant trust officer, was also a loaned executive to NAB for three months.

The NAB's major goal is to find jobs for 500,000 chronically unemployed people by mid-1971. In addition, its aim was to provide 200,000 needy youths with jobs this summer. Each city has its own quota of the national goal. Portland, for example, has a goal of procuring 2,000 new job pledges for people to be on the job by next June. Mills reported, "Our NAB office secured 3,600 job pledges already, 1,600 over the quota given us by Washington, D.C."

The NAB program is an effort on the part of business leaders such as U.S. National to urge private industry to assume an aggressive role in employment of the hard core unemployed. The term hard core signifies people who, in addition to being poor, are chronically unemployed or underemployed due to one or more of several factors such as skin color, physical handicap, lack of education, age, or criminal record. While the program to aid the hard core is not exclusively aimed at Black people, it is often associated with them because the largest group to suffer chronic unemployment are Black, poor, and undereducated.

For the two years since NAB's inception, the Bank has participated in the program. In 1968, U.S. National filled its NAB commitment by providing summer work for ten hard core youths and hiring nine hard core people to full-time jobs. In each case, vocational training accompanied the job. The commitment for 1969 was 18 additional full-time jobs. By June, 1970, U.S. National will have 27 full-time, formerly hard core people, on the payroll. The Bank also participates on a fair-share basis to help with the costs of conducting the NAB program in Portland.

Probably the most spectacular demonstration of the Bank's Affirmative Action policy has been the \$10,000 grant U.S. National gave to a group of Black Washington High School students. Other than the stipulation that the money should be used to set up a business, there were no strings attached. Nevertheless, the students weren't left entirely on their own. They had access to a board of businessmen headed by Duane Perron, assistant vice president in Manpower Development, for advice and support. The idea was to give Black students an experience in capitalism, to teach them the free enterprise system by having them set up their own business. At the same time, it would provide summer jobs for Black youths.

The business the students established is the Malcolm X Corporation, a non-profit, wholly-owned subsidiary of the Bank. The students examined various products, frequently conferred with their advisors, decided to build pallets for construction, and went into production early this summer.

Selection of the students was based largely on the leadership qualities and scholastic achievement they had demonstrated in high school. In short, most were outstanding. The aim has been to develop leadership and business knowledge in the Black community with the hope that a long-range outcome will be to help the Black hard core. But an immediate result was that the students hired up to 22 people during the height of production, thus providing summer jobs for unemployed Black youths, some of whom were members of the hard core.

Even before Affirmative Action became a phrase, U.S. National had begun to carry out its policy. In 1964 the Bank began participating with several other Oregon businesses in Work Motivation Clinics. The clinics, conducted in Portland high schools, are designed to keep potential drop-outs in school. Duane Perron has been a member of a four-man panel that goes into the schools to hold informal discussions with groups of low-achieving students. Panel members discuss the student career goals and stress the importance of staying in school in order to realize these goals. Panel members also talk about their own companies' hiring practices and job openings to let the students know that jobs are available for those who qualify themselves. The hope is that the clinics focus attention on an age-group still young enough to alter bad habits and attitudes. High school counselors have responded with enthusiasm, explaining that the clinics are one way of letting low-achieving students, many from minority groups, know business cares about them.

While these programs are the principal ways U.S. National demonstrates its Affirmative Action policy, they are by no means the only ways. Individual staff members have accepted social involvement in literally dozens of ways, serving on committees, acting as advisors, providing vocational training, and contributing funds. A number of people have been authorized to use Bank time and facilities for their Affirmative Action work.

No business, certainly not U.S. National, is kidding itself that social ills will be cured overnight. There may be years of urban crisis ahead. But a step has been taken.

The Bank also works with the Urban League as part of its Affirmative Action policy. Job openings are communicated to the League, which refers applicants to the Bank. In 1968, the Bank's Education Department also conducted a Clerical Upgrading Clinic for eight women referred to them by the Urban League.

Every Tuesday and Thursday night for eight weeks the girls received training in office skills such as typing, adding machine practice, filing systems, business English, and telephone procedures. Several staff members participated on their own time to give the girls instructions in these skills. Shelley Signett of the Education Department coordinated the classes, which were held at Head Office. At the end of the program, each of the girls received individual counseling from Al Stromquist, vice president in Personnel, to help them plan their future careers and further educational needs.

HOW DO YOU MEASURE A CONTRIBUTION TO SOCIETY?

The news was jolting. U.S. National Bank had given five Black students \$10,000—apparently no strings attached. Duane Perron, assistant vice president in Manpower Development, talks about the Bank's unique experiment teaching Black youths about the free enterprise system.

How did the Malcolm X Corporation come about?

I asked management what do you want to do in Affirmative Action. They answered they wanted to be leaders. Okay, to be leaders you have to be innovative and imaginative. For something to be innovative it has to be new; it has to be untried; and it has to be risky. It isn't easy for any business to do something risky. Our management agreed to give a \$10,000 grant to develop an Affirmative Action program. They were willing to stick their necks out.

Why didn't the Bank simply provide jobs for disadvantaged people?

Last summer we did. We had them pulling weeds and painting pipes. They considered it "picken cotton for the white man." But if you go the other direction and give them jobs they don't have skills for, it's not much different from putting them on the dole. Last summer we didn't teach anything significant or develop any new skills. We certainly didn't change any attitudes.

How did you come with this particular program?

We wanted to teach Black students about the capitalistic system. The only way to do that is to let them participate in it. I brought together a group of Portland businessmen, and we brainstormed. We had to fight the temptation to set up the whole business, select the product, and lay it all out for the kids. The only way for them to learn the decision-making process is to let them make their own decisions. All we did was develop three basic goals. But the kids had to take it from there. We were strictly hands off. We were there to advise them if they wanted it, but they had to make up their minds about what to produce, how to market it, and so on.

What were the three goals you set down?

First, to produce a needed product; second, to employ as many youths as possible during the summer; and third, to provide an experience in free enterprise.

How did you select the kids?

The counselors at the high school actually selected them. We chose Washington High because it has a 13 per cent Black enrollment and, being on the periphery of the Black district, is a potential trouble spot. Incidentally, four of the original five kids are still with the company.

What about the \$10,000; weren't any strings attached to that?

We told the five kids to pay themselves \$500 each for working during the summer. Believe me, they earned it. The rest, \$7,500, was for investment or business development. The kids decided to give 25 per cent of any net profit to a Washington High School college scholarship fund and to retain 75 per cent as profit-share for their employees. If the company liquidates, remaining assets will go to the scholarship fund. The Bank won't be in on any of the profits. We don't expect any payoff—except in the long-range community benefits.

What about the scholarship; who selects the recipient?

The recipient is determined by the school. We have nothing to do with that.

How has the community reacted to the program?

We've had outstanding reaction from the community. Probably some of it is simply that you'd be a heavy if you didn't support this idea. The only real adverse reaction has been from some militant Blacks who think the Bank is out for the publicity.

Was there any adverse reaction from customers?

We received phone calls from a few. One man wanted to know why we turned him down for a loan because of tight money if we could afford to give \$10,000 to these kids. This is a legitimate question and tough to answer.

How did you answer them?

My answer was that the Bank is not in business only to make money. We're here to help the community too. We have a responsibility to share in solving serious social problems. At the moment, the minority problem is one of the most serious. I'm glad they called, because they ended up supporting the idea.

What has been the Bank's policy on publicity?

At the beginning we didn't want publicity. The original source of the story was Washington High School, not us. The story was picked up from the *Oregonian* by the Associated Press. It made it as far as the *New York Times* and was broadcast all over radio and television. We had to ask the press to cool it. We were getting the confidence of these kids and didn't want to lose it because of a lot of publicity. Okay, we're talking about it right now, but that's because the story is out, and we want to make sure our own people have the facts. At the same time, we want other companies to hear about the program so they can try it themselves.

By supporting Black capitalism aren't you concerned that you may be going in the opposite direction of integration? After all, you are promoting an all-Black business.

We have a subculture in this country, and we haven't admitted it. We think we're talking about integrating when we're really talking about assimilating. We tell Blacks to wear our clothes, to talk the way we do, and we'll give them a job. But integration is meeting them half way. We judge them critically by the way they talk, but they communicate with each other beautifully. We have to bring them up as a subculture before we integrate. They must understand Black capitalism before they can understand White capitalism. We have to teach them Americanism. They've been in America, but we haven't let them see it.

What is your role in the Malcolm X Corporation?

My role has been that of adviser, along with other members of the board. We—and that includes Joseph Ward and Johnny Bell from our Bank, Phil McAllister from Lewis & Clark College, and Bruce Samson from the telephone company—offer advice, but final decisions rest with the kids. To prove this point, look at the name of the corporation. When they said they were naming the company Malcolm X, I nearly flipped. This was a real test for our management. They knew that the Bank's name linked with Malcolm X would trigger an emotional reaction, and they could have put the skids on it right there. But they meant what they said when they said they'd keep their hands off.

Why was the name Malcolm X chosen?

The kids' reasons for naming it Malcolm X were simple. Our conversation went something like this. Kids: We've decided to name it Malcolm X. Pause. Me: Why in the world? Kids: Because he was a great man. What do you know about him? Me: Nothing. Kids: Then read his biography. Well, I read it, and they were right. I didn't always agree with him, but he was a great man. He advocated having the Black people play a greater role in our society, and that's all we're doing, isn't it?

Have you had any problems with the company?

We had problems! Organizing a small business in this day and age is one monumental problem. Add to that a situation that fits no previous pattern, and you really have a headache. I had a lot to learn, and we made mistakes. The kids themselves have made several innovations. They had to deal with other kids who showed up late, goofed off, things like that. One innovation was to tell their employees they could show up any time as long as they were the top producer. So the kids who showed up at 10 a.m. had to work like crazy to catch up with the kids who came in at 8. But then the kids who came

at 8 would work like crazy to make sure the late ones didn't catch up. This really gave us some progress.

Why did the kids decide to make pallets?

The reason they selected pallets was the high labor input and low skill factor. But they're not limited, and they're looking around for other products.

How many jobs did the program provide this summer?

Our work force is actually determined by our contracts. At the height of production we had 22 kids working. That's a lot more than we put to work in the Bank last summer.

Besides the \$10,000, what did the Bank put in?

They borrowed some furniture and some of our staff for advice and counsel. Several staff members helped, for example, showing the girls how to handle the books.

I won't ask you what the kids got out of this because I'll ask them, but what have you learned from this experience?

It's been an absolutely fantastic experience in communication. I feel very at home with these kids. We're able to attack each other's ideas without the usual Black-White hang-ups. We don't have to worry about what we say. You know, this is how it's got to be. We won't have a bias-free society until you can walk away and forget the color of a person's skin. We don't remember people's eye color. Why not? Because it's not important. The reason we remember someone is Black is because it's important to us.

Did you run into much bias?

I've learned a disgusting amount of bias still exists. Everyone seems to want to help, but many people give loud lip service then play hide-and-seek behind red tape and rationalizations. The main thing is they're afraid. I was afraid at the beginning, myself. The Whites are more afraid than the kids. We have our stereotypes. We think of the high crime rate in Albina. But the per capita juvenile delinquency there ranks fifth in the state.

Did any of the bias come from the Blacks?

I think Black kids have more bias than Whites, but it's strictly a defense mechanism. I found out how that works. Some friends took me into an all-Black bar. No one was rude or said anything, but I felt strange, defensive, ill at ease. For the first time I got an idea of what it must be like for a Black to come to work in a White corporation. Another thing I learned is that these kids are much more perceptive about your feelings because they've been sensitized to prejudice. If they're cool to you, they're just mirroring your reaction to them.

Where do things stand now with the Malcolm X Corporation?

We're in a lull right now. The red tape's catching up with us. School's starting again, and we're worrying about liquidating inventories, storing tools, getting our books in order, things like that. If we'd worried about the red tape in the beginning, we would never have gotten off the ground and had these kids working this summer. We should be in better shape next summer. We'll have had a year to plan. We only had two months to get the whole thing going this year. We hope to involve more kids too. The school may even give academic credit to students who work on this. They would have a class or seminar in which they discuss aspects of production and marketing problems.

Was there any profit for the corporation?

Profit? No, they've sustained a loss because we've had a lot of initial set-up costs, managerial error, buying tools, rent. We couldn't amortize because of the short term. But the point isn't dollars and cents. The point is that for a little money and a lot of advice, we've started some kids. Their contributions could be manifold. We've taken kids off the street and given them work. How do you measure a contribution to society? Not in money.

Will the Bank continue its involvement?

The Bank is going to have to continue to spearhead this because someone is going to have to care enough to provide resources. Malcolm X has a management turnover because the kids must get out when they graduate. We encourage our kids to go to college. We'll probably continue at Washington because we have all we can handle there. I am trying to convince other companies to go into other schools.

Have any other companies shown an interest?

Yes, we've had many inquiries, and the city of Eugene has inquired about setting up a subsidiary there to put Black people to work.

What hopes and plans do you have for this project?

First, I hope this will be perpetual, that it will continue next summer. Secondly, as I said, I hope to pass this concept to other companies. Putting unqualified Black people on make-work jobs is no answer to the problem. What we call lack of motivation on the part of many Blacks is simply lack of basic knowledge. We have quite an education job on our hands. I heard a fellow put it well once; he said we need to trade expertise for soul.

THAT'S WHAT WE ALL LACKED . . . RESPONSIBILITY

Malcolm X and U.S. National Bank are an unlikely combination of names. Lee McClinton, 18-year-old president of the Malcolm X Corporation, tells it like it is and makes it all sound likely.

How did you get involved in the Malcolm X Corporation?

It got started at the Bank. They came to Washington High School and asked Mr. Jones, our vice principal, to pick five students. So the counselors picked us.

Do you know why you five were chosen?

Well, all five of us were in school politics. Jack Dizer was president of the Black Student League. Louis Turner was sergeant-at-arms of the junior class and in the Boys League, too. Sandra Jackson was sophomore class rep to the Girls League. I was president of the Boys League. Those are the four who stayed out of the original five.

Was there any reaction to the proposed project?

Well, there was no bad reaction from anybody, except my brother—and he's just that way.

Didn't people think the Bank was doing it for publicity?

Oh yeah, a lot of people thought that. But the first guy I heard that from worked at another bank. I really don't know if they still feel that way. No one says that now.

Do you think that promoting Black capitalism is at odds with integration?

No, if you sit down and think what integration means. To some it means only integration into the White race. I mean like Black kids are sent to White schools or Black people go into White businesses. But integration really means a 50-50 deal. Not just Black into White, but White into Black, too. So you've got to have Black businesses, too.

How did you come up with the name Malcolm X?

Another girl came up with the idea. It wasn't my idea; we didn't really agree. But we both felt he was a great man. We felt it was a tribute to him. He's pretty hard to describe. I mean he was a Black Muslim, and like all Muslims he believed White men were evil. But then he went to Mecca, and there were all these Moslems—all colors—living together, like they should. So when he came back, he preached that's how it could be. That's one reason he was killed. I mean he was just saying that all colors of Moslems could live together, but that's a start. That's at least how I got it when I read about him.

Weren't you aware this name might cause an emotional reaction?

The deal is, why go into something backwards? Be what you are. Don't be afraid to be what you are. If we lost customers because of that, then we didn't want to deal with them anyway.

What about the kids; is there a lot of militism among them?

Yes, most Black kids have militant feelings. I think we had five Panthers working for us. Are you prejudiced?

No . . . two wrongs don't make a right.

Did you have any problems with your company?

Yeah, everything we did just about was a problem, because of our age, our lack of knowledge.

What kinds of problems?

Like getting our corporate structure set up, trying to set it up so U.S. could stay non-profit. We had problems with our workers coming in late or goofing off. We're still not over that. We had the problem of getting a forklift to get our wood in and move the pallets out. Even getting our water turned on was a problem.

What recommendations would you make for next summer?

First of all, instead of just jumping into it, you should sit down with the kids and have them plan what's to be done. You'll have two of the kids coming back with experience next year. Say they pick a janitorial service to run, they're going to need insurance. Now I'm just saying these things from the top of my head, because I'm not sure. But they will probably need a special license for the ones who do the driving. They'll have to figure out their utensils and things. Man, I've sure found out it's hard to run a business. Maybe there should be someone from the Bank eight hours a day working with the kids to help them with their problems. Phil McAllister would come down a few times; Duane would drop in when he could. Another thing I would recommend is that nothing should go in or out without the approval of the kids. One of our advisors negotiated our price with one company, and he didn't know what the cost of labor was. We ended up losing a quarter on each pallet we made for them.

Most of these recommendations are aimed at your advisors. What recommendations do you have for the kids?

This is really important. As a way of getting more confidence, the kids should go out and talk to people, like businessmen, and get loose so that when it's time to work with money they won't be scared. I talked to Mr. Staver. He's a pretty nice guy. I'd love to go out and tell businessmen what's happening. I've been thinking I might like to come back as an advisor. You know, Duane and I could help them a lot. This thing helped me a lot—the other kids too—like with self-confidence and responsibility. That's what we all lacked . . . responsibility.

What else have you gained?

I really think our main goal was accomplished. We learned about business. For a lot of them the whole purpose was to make money this summer. But the five of us learned. Sandra learned about books; Jack learned about employees.

How did you learn?

We had to worry about getting a forklift. Then we had to worry about the thickness of the floor, to see if it would hold the lift. We had to plan our space needs, our equipment needs, decide on our work hours, and how many breaks. We worried about if someone took 15 minutes for break would he be too lazy to get to work when he came back. Some of the little things were the most problem.

Now that you've graduated, what are your plans?

I don't know. I'm a student at Portland State—technically, but school hasn't started. I'm interested in school. I'm planning to go to college.

Do you think you'd ever go into business as a career?

Well, since I was old enough to think and talk, I've always wanted to be a lawyer. My mother says I'm a pretty good talker. But Duane thinks I should take Business Administration courses as an undergraduate, then go into law. I think that might be a good idea.

And what about the Malcolm X Corporation; do you think it's worth continuing?

I think it's one of the greatest things anyone's gotten into. Next year will be a good year. The year after, too. We've got sophomores coming back. It's doing something. It's going somewhere. No matter how much you lose, you still gain something.

METROPOLITAN COUNCIL ON HOUSING URGES FEDERAL SUBSIDY TO PRESERVE RENTS

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the Metropolitan Council on Housing of New York City is a grassroots organization representing some 100 tenant groups. It has argued effectively and persuasively for years for programs which will make decent integrated housing available to all New Yorkers at reasonable rents. On July 25, 1969, Miss Jane Benedict, chairman of the metropolitan council on housing and Mr. Leroy Adolph, chairman of the public housing committee, who is also the chairman of the Drew Hamilton public housing project, testified before the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. They stressed the desperate situation facing tenants in public housing who are confronted with ever increasing rents because of the operating deficit of the New York City Housing Authority and urged legislation to change the Federal subsidy formula to increase the allocation to public housing authorities so that rents can be maintained at a level which low-income families can afford to pay.

I have introduced H.R. 10194 which would accomplish this objective, and I urge my colleagues to heed the words of the metropolitan council on housing in order to understand the seriousness of the situation. The testimony of Miss Jane Benedict and Mr. Leroy Adolph follows:

STATEMENT OF MISS JANE BENEDICT, CHAIRMAN, METROPOLITAN COUNCIL ON HOUSING, NEW YORK CITY; AND LEROY ADOLPH, CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC HOUSING COMMITTEE, METROPOLITAN COUNCIL ON HOUSING, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, SENATE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, JULY 25, 1969

MISS BENEDICT. I am chairman of Metropolitan Council on Housing, a New York City federation of some 100 tenant groups and individual members, dedicated to a broad program for decent, integrated housing at rents people can afford. We have been working toward our goal for more than 10 years—nearly all of us are volunteers, and which is some indication of the staying power, I should like to remark, and all of us represent the grassroots of the communities represented.

The people you saw come in the room a short time ago are tenants of public housing

projects in New York City who came down by bus at their own expense at \$7 per person because they considered it of importance to them to be here to be able in some way to present their case to you through us, hopefully.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very glad to have them.

MISS BENEDICT. Thank you.

This program embraces the organizing of tenants in all kinds of housing, including public housing. We have, therefore, a public housing committee made up of these tenants, whose chairman is Mr. Leroy Adolph on my right. He will testify in just a few moments. I assure you Mr. Adolph knows whereof he speaks. He is the chairman of Drew-Hamilton which is a public housing project in Manhattan. He and his wife have three sons ranging from 8 to 15 years. And when he speaks of the problems of public housing tenants, he knows them intimately.

We have come here today to urge your adoption of an amendment to the U.S. Housing Act of 1937, which would allow an appropriation to help meet the operating deficit of the New York City Housing Authority. The reason we take this position is that if the deficit is not met by liberalization of the law, it is going to be met by the almost empty pockets of the public housing tenants. And we consider this intolerable, impossible.

We underscore the statements that have come from New York City's administration that were previously stated, but we state them from a very fundamental and grassroots and people's point of view.

To say that in New York City there is a housing shortage is not to paint the picture. There is a housing famine. There is an official figure of a vacancy ratio of 1.23 percent. Not even slum apartments are available. Six hundred thousand people live in New York City public housing in some 160 public housing projects.

Mr. Walsh told you officially that the waiting list for public housing is 135,000 applications of eligible people under the laws. And the present eligibility laws are stringent.

We in New York City could use 100,000 apartments of publicly owned housing per year for the next 5 years to even begin to catch up with the shortage of apartments and the deteriorating apartments. And this is a picture of the disastrous situation in New York City.

Those tenants in public housing who are on public welfare, who are the minority in public housing, have already received a 47-percent increase in order to try to meet the operating costs of the New York City Housing Authority. I think we must put on record that we feel this increase is totally unjust.

We want to remark in passing that welfare clients are said not to feel this increase because it does not come out of their own pockets. This, of course, is fallacious reasoning. In the long run, they will feel it. We have had cuts in welfare from the New York State Legislature. And what comes out of one budget is bound to be reflected in another budget. And in toto the welfare clients will indeed feel that they are helping to meet the deficit of the New York City Housing Authority.

It has already been indicated that the New York City Housing Authority will give a 25-percent increase to the rest of the tenants in federally financed public housing who are not on welfare. This is an absolutely intolerable situation.

We understand that there is an administration bill which like S. 527 would allow money to be allocated to matters other than debt financing. It would allow \$6.5 million nationally—less than S. 527, if we understand it correctly. This would be totally inadequate. The present deficit, we understand, of the New York City Housing Authority is some \$5 million at this point and constantly rising.

We urge that the most generous formula be adopted by you.

The operating deficit of the New York City Housing Authority must be met and not met out of the tenants' inadequate pockets.

It is impossible to find adequate words to describe New York City's housing problem. No housing is being built for the poor except public housing, and it is an eye-dropper full of that as has already been indicated. Ghetto housing is indescribable. No housing is being built for the middle-income tenant except that which is subsidized. Even that is going out of sight rentwise. The only housing being built by private housing developers is at a rental of \$75 to \$125 per room per month—hardly housing for the average citizens.

Added to that, commercial office buildings are on the tremendous increase as the real estate bonanza in New York City. And so far nobody has found it possible to live in the office buildings.

Public housing is a crying and fundamental necessity. It cannot be allowed to be wiped out by rent increases which will negate the low-income character of public housing. The Metropolitan Council on Housing feels deeply that the needs of low-income people must be dealt with as a primary concern. We organize and fight for middle-income and middle-class tenants as well, but if the housing needs of low-income black, white, and Puerto Rican tenants in a city as large and complex as New York are not cared for, then the explosiveness of our city is bound to increase.

In short, gentlemen, we urge a formula which will prevent unconscionable rent increases for people who simply do not have it to give. We urge section 5 of S. 527 or some adaptation of the type of bills that Congressman Ryan has, we understand, in the House of Representatives which would allow any subsidy which is necessary as described here. Anything less than this will mean that the basic need for shelter has been tossed aside.

I would like to add one word. Our concept of public housing which we certainly do not have time to go into, is indicated in what we call the Public Housing Tenants Bill of Rights in which tenants have control in public housing in a way that they do not have now because public housing is an institutionalized thing. I should like to hand up copies of this.

And one last thing, sir. We feel that the matter of shelter in this country is so basic a necessity that if, indeed, private industry cannot meet it; if, indeed, it cannot be met by the present situation; if, indeed, there are all kinds of problems of technicalities and legislation and so on, which pile up and seem imponderable, it is the responsibility of government beginning with the Federal Government and so on to the State and the local, to shoulder the responsibility of adequate shelter of people at rents that they can afford. And that is why we are here.

I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

I may say that Congressman Ryan has sent a statement over with reference to the housing situation. And it will be printed in the record.

Miss BENEDICT. Thank you.

(The statement of Congressman Ryan follows:)

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM F. RYAN, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate having this opportunity to present my views on urgent housing needs to the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs.

While I have introduced numerous bills in this session of Congress which relate to housing needs in our large metropolitan areas, I intent to limit my remarks today to legislation concerned with federally-aided

public housing which is pending before this Subcommittee.

As the Members of this Subcommittee may know, operating expenses of the federally-aided public housing program in New York City have increased to such an extent that tenants are facing increased rentals beyond their means. Given the limited financial resources of most cities, this problem can only be alleviated by increasing the amount of Federal subsidies which the department of Housing and Urban Development is authorized to allocate to local public housing agencies. So that you will have a better understanding of the need for a new subsidy formula and not just clarifications of existing authority, let me discuss this situation in relation to New York City.

According to the New York City Housing Authority, routine operating expenses of the federally-aided public housing program in New York City have increased 125% since 1952. Rents paid by tenants, related to their incomes, have increased 72%. The deficits to the public housing program which have resulted have grown so acute during the past few years that it has been necessary for the Housing Authority to withdraw funds from its reserves. Under established procedures, the accumulated reserve funds for the New York City Housing Authority should currently amount to somewhat more than \$30 million. But the present balance as of March 1969, is only about \$12 million. Chairman Albert Walsh of the New York City Housing Authority has indicated that he expects complete exhaustion of reserve funds before the close of 1970, unless rents of tenants are substantially increased without regard to their ability to pay.

The alternative for New York, then is total exhaustion of reserve funds in 18 months or an increase in rents that most tenants simply will not be able to meet.

At the present time, the Department of Housing and Urban Development contracts to pay annually to the New York City Public Housing Authority only the sum actually required for debt service on bonds issued for the capital cost of each public housing project. Although it is my interpretation, and the interpretation of New York City Housing Authority Chairman Albert Walsh, that HUD presently has authority, under section 10(c) and (d) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, to pay the debt service plus two percent of the operational cost of a public housing project, HUD apparently takes the position that the basic statute needs to be clarified. Accordingly, HUD has recommended the clarifying language which is contained in Section 5 of S. 527 and Section 204 of S. 2620. HUD seems to believe that in order to pay the two percent specified in section 10(c) and (d) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, it is necessary to have language which specifies that the annual contribution under any contract is not limited to debt services requirements.

In other words, the amendment requested by the Administration would merely state that HUD has the authority to do what I believe it already has authority to do under the existing statute. This is clear from the testimony of Secretary Romney on July 15 before this subcommittee in which he said: "The amendment [Section 204 of S. 2620] would not, however, permit the annual contributions to exceed the statutory maximum now established by the United States Housing Act of 1937."

I have previously called upon Secretary Romney to increase the subsidy for public housing in New York City to the statutory maximum through administrative action. Instead of asking for an increase in the statutory maximum, which is essential, the Administration is proposing "clarifying" legislation in order to do what it has the power to do administratively.

In light of the increasing operating costs which many public housing agencies are experiencing, I believe that mere clarifying language is an insufficient remedy for the problem. What is required is an increase in the present statutory limit.

In order to achieve that end, I have introduced H.R. 10194, which changes the present subsidy formula so that the formula would specifically include debt service plus one percent and an additional amount "to the extent required to permit low-rent housing to continue to fulfill its goal of providing housing at rents which families of low income can afford to pay, taking into account such routine operating costs of the projects involved (including the cost of providing adequate security for tenants) as may be necessary or appropriate for the purpose."

In effect, H.R. 10194 would make it possible for the Secretary to determine the subsidy formula required to maintain rents at a level which low-income families can afford, taking into account normal operating expenses and particularly the cost of police protection for tenants, which, in most large cities is urgently needed. Rising crime rates in public housing projects in New York City are alarming—so much so that tenants feel compelled to organize volunteer groups to protect themselves.

Section 2 of H.R. 10194 would permit the secretary to increase the cost limitations to the extent necessary to reflect increases in construction cost for a particular geographic area. In New York City, where construction costs are skyrocketing, this flexibility is essential if the demand for public housing is to be met.

Section 3 of my bill makes it clear that the new subsidy formula set forth in the bill would apply to existing projects as well as projects completed after the enactment of this legislation.

In view of the escalating costs of public housing agencies, I believe it is imperative that this body adopt a formula such as the one embodied in H.R. 10194. To accept only a "clarification" in language which I believe already gives clear authority to the Department of Housing and Urban Development to pay debt service requirements plus two percent of operating costs falls far short of what is required.

H.R. 10194

A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to increase the amount of the annual contributions which may be paid thereunder with respect to low-rent housing projects by establishing a more realistic subsidy formula, and to permit increases in the statutory per-room cost limits applicable to such projects to the extent necessary to reflect rises in construction costs

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second proviso in section 10(c) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by striking out "by 1 per centum of development or acquisition cost" and inserting in lieu thereof "to the extent required to permit low-rent housing to continue to fulfill its goal of providing housing at rents which families of low income can afford to pay, taking into account such routine operating costs of the projects involved (including the cost of providing adequate security for tenants) as may be necessary or appropriate for the purpose".

Sec. 2. The first sentence of section 15(5) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "Provided further, That in addition the Secretary may increase any of the cost limitations established by or under the preceding provisions of this sentence, with respect to projects in

any geographical area, to the extent necessary to reflect any rises in the index of construction costs for such area which may have occurred since August 10, 1965".

SEC. 3. Any contract for annual contributions under the United States Housing Act of 1937 which was executed prior to the date of the enactment of this Act may be amended to incorporate the amendments made by the first two sections of this Act, effective with respect to periods after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Adolph.

MR. ADOLPH. Thank you, Senator.

My name is Leroy Adolph. And as previously told you by Miss Benedict, I am the chairman of the Public Housing Committee, Metropolitan Council on Housing. And I am also the chairman of our own local Tenant Association in Drew-Hamilton project.

Gentlemen, it may come as a surprise, or for lack of a better word, a little odd to you gentlemen, that a group of people—little people who have very little money, would go to the expense of coming here to Washington from New York for what might seem to you as an unnecessary reason. You may well wonder why we, the members of the Public Housing Committee of the Metropolitan Council on Housing, would go to the great effort of obtaining and investigating the law that you are considering; of writing to you for speaking time; or printing and distributing letters and leaflets to public housing tenants and interested people to make them more knowledgeable about what is happening at these committee hearings, so that they will be motivated and mobilized into coming to Washington to take part in the business of this committee. This we have done by mailing, phoning, making personal contacts, or any other method we could devise.

The people here are from Bronx River project, Manhattan Ville, Drew-Hamilton, Polo Grounds—I would like them to stand.

The CHAIRMAN. We saw them come in.

You may stand if you wish.

O.K. thank you very much.

Now, Mr. Adolph, move along. You have 5 more minutes.

MR. ADOLPH. The answer to all of this is quite simple. One of the proposed amendments that is being considered by this committee concerns us. It concerns us so directly that we could not, in all good conscience, pass up the opportunity to have our say. For many, many months we have been looking for just such an opportunity to have our "day in court"; to be able to get across to a group such as yourselves, who can possibly make a change, the plight of the public housing tenant and the many day-to-day problems with which he must live.

At its inception, the concept of public housing was to help people, not hinder and frustrate them. It was, in fact, intended to aid those people who have meager funds at their disposal to at least live with some kind of dignity in safe, decent homes—at rents they could afford. But somewhere along the line this original concept has been either forgotten, ignored, or pushed aside by needless, senseless wars, the race to outer space or some other very "pressing and important matters" leaving people who provide the "lion's share" of the financial support for the "important matters" to fend for themselves with not much to fend with, after taxes.

The public housing tenant does not want charity, favors, or welfare. All they want is what is coming to them under the original concept of public housing—a decent home in which to house and raise their children. We cannot do this under the present conditions. Every year we are subjected to salary reports, which very often result in some sort of rent increase if there is any kind of an increase in salary.

It seems that under the present setup, that

those in public housing who aspire to a better life for themselves and their families financially by working for job promotions or salary increases are penalized by getting a subsequent rent increase or by being evicted because of "over income for continued occupancy." Gentlemen, this has got to stop. My landlord, the New York City Housing Authority, claims it must have more money to run the authority. It normally receives subsidies from city, State, and Federal sources. If this is not enough to do the job, the final alternative is usually the public housing tenant himself. We in public housing are living from day to day with the threat of continuous rent increases hanging over our heads.

We cannot plan anything on a long-range basis such as higher education for our children, an occasional vacation, or any of the pleasantries of life, which is no life at all. The present situation in public housing is breeding a generation of liars because we must train our children to lie and scheme about what they earn and how they earn it, because this is the only way that we can survive. There will be no astronauts coming out of the public housing system, because all of one's life is taken up with making it on this planet. As a matter of fact, our kids will hardly be able to compete in a very competitive world for the very same reasons.

What we came to Washington today for is to ask you to seriously consider favorably any means by which the yearly subsidy to the New York City Housing Authority and all such other housing authorities that handle people like ourselves can be increased in order to take the pressure off the tenant. This may be our last opportunity to alleviate the frustration that can only lead to either a deep depressing apathy or vandalism or violence of some nature against what they feel is their oppressor, the housing authority.

I realize that this may be a naive approach to the problem and nothing is ever that simple. But as simple, uncomplicated people with the normal needs of people of our station in life, we have no other approach to the problem, which is just one of many that plague the tenants in public housing. We have been asked many times: If public housing is so difficult to live in and with, why not leave, move out? Our answer to this is another question: Move out and go where? Back to the slums, with the rats and roaches? Unfortunately, our families in public housing, which include widowed or husbandless women with small children, senior citizens on small pensions or social security, welfare families, have no other choice but to stay and live and fight the ongoing day-to-day problems. It is our firm belief that public housing is the answer to the Nation's housing problems, and can be made to work if the powers that be address themselves to the problems that exist and overcome them, one by one, like it was done in the attempt to reach the moon. We also feel that as elected representatives of the people, you must do whatever you can to better the lot of these many families. In New York City alone we have some 600,000 people living in public housing who are depending on the outcome of this committee's hearings. Please do not let these many people down. Do whatever you can, anyway you can. I am sure that they will know how to show their appreciation.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Adolph. You still have 25 seconds. [Applause.]

You did a splendid job in making the presentation. And we are pleased to have the facts.

I may say this: Over the years, this is not new. It is new in degree. But over the years we have been confronted with the difficult problem of trying to get a public housing program or housing program of some kind that would provide decent homes for people of all income levels down the ladder. It has

been most difficult to do it. We feel our inadequacy in it.

I think both you and Miss Benedict made a very fine presentation of the facts, the conditions, and I assure you our committee will give the fullest consideration to it. Thank you very much.

MISS BENEDICT. Senator, might I say one word just in closing in the 25 seconds that Mr. Adolph has?

The CHAIRMAN. You have 10 seconds.

I am being facetious, of course.

MISS BENEDICT. The fact, sir, that this has been a continuing problem for many years is, of course, true. I think the problem of shelter has never really been solved in this country throughout our history.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to say that we have made headway on it, but we have never been able to get down to the lowest level.

MISS BENEDICT. That is correct. And today, I think we have a greater crisis than we ever had, particularly in as complex a situation as New York and in all the urban centers. As we all know now, the city is the epitome of the problem. And it is so explosive a problem and so disastrous a problem that it is not enough to say that we have always lived with it.

But let me state that if we have managed to pour the many billions that we have into the Vietnamese war, then today when we are facing a problem this enormous at home that is so profound, certainly this economy must put the same amount of effort into this present crisis.

The CHAIRMAN. We will certainly keep working on it. Thank you very much.

(The complete statements of Miss Benedict and Mr. Adolph, including the Tenants Bill of Rights follow:)

STATEMENT OF JANE BENEDICT, CHAIRMAN OF METROPOLITAN COUNCIL ON HOUSING

MR. CHAIRMAN, Gentlemen, my name is Jane Benedict. I am chairman of Metropolitan Council on Housing, a New York City federation of some 100 tenant groups and individual members, dedicated to a broad program for decent, integrated housing at rents people can afford. We have been working toward our goal for more than ten years—nearly all of us are volunteers, and all of us represent the grass roots of the communities represented.

This program embraces the organizing of tenants in all kinds of housing, including public housing. We have, therefore, a Public Housing Committee made up of these tenants, whose chairman is Mr. Leroy Adolph. He will testify in just a few moments. Mr. Adolph lives in Drew-Hamilton, a project in New York City's Harlem. He and his wife have three sons ranging in age from 8 to 15 years. When he speaks I assure you he is an accurate spokesman for those who live in public housing.

We have come here today to urge your adoption of an amendment to the United States Housing Act of 1937, which would allow an appropriation to help meet the operating deficit of the New York City Housing Authority. If this deficit is not met by liberalizing the law, it will be met by rent increases for public housing tenants. The result will be that thousands of New York City public housing tenants will be forced out of their homes.

In New York there is a housing famine. With an official figure of 1.23% vacancy ratio, not even slum apartments are available. There are 600,000 New York City public housing tenants living in over 160 projects, scattered in the City's five boroughs. Tenants living in these projects who are receiving public assistance from the Social Welfare Department have already received a 47% rent increase in order to try to make up for the operating deficit of the New York City Housing Authority.

We feel this increase totally unjust; let me

remark simply in passing that it is untrue that welfare clients will not feel the increase because they do not pay it out of their own pockets. There are already New York State cuts ordered as of July 1, and no matter from what budget, the welfare rent increase is paid, the welfare recipient will eventually be cut in some other direction to make up for the rent increases.

In addition, it has been announced that unless the money is forthcoming from other quarters, the non-welfare tenants in federally-aided low-income public housing will receive a 25% increase.

We understand there is an administration bill which, like S. 527, would allow money to be allocated to matters other than debt financing. It would allow \$6,500,000 nationally—less than S. 527. We urge that the most generous formula be adopted by you. The operating deficit of the New York City Housing Authority now stands at \$5 million. We understand still further that Congressman Ryan has submitted a bill allowing whatever subsidies are necessary. We do not know whether there is a companion bill in the Senate. If there is, we support it. I repeat, we urge the most generous formula—which is apparently *not* the Administration bill, which will allow money to help defray the deficit of the New York City Housing Authority, instead of taking it from the empty pockets of the Authority's tenants.

It is impossible to find adequate words to describe New York City's housing problem. No housing is being built for the poor except public housing (and an eyedropper-full of that). Ghetto housing is indescribable. No housing is being built for the middle-income tenant, except that which is subsidized. Even that is going out-of-sight rent-wise. The only housing being built by private housing developers is at a rental of \$75 to \$125 per room per month—hardly housing for the average citizen.

Public housing is a crying and fundamental necessity. It cannot be allowed to be wiped out by rent increases which will negate the low-income character of public housing. Metropolitan Council on Housing feels deeply that the needs of low-income people *must* be dealt with as a primary concern. We organize and fight for middle-income and middle-class tenants as well. But if the housing needs of low-income black, white and Puerto Rican tenants in a city as large and complex as New York are not cared for, then the explosiveness of our City will simply increase.

In short, gentlemen, we urge a formula which will prevent unconscionable rent increases for people who simply do not have it to give. We urge Section 5 of S. 527—or an improvement of it. Anything less will mean that the basic need for shelter has been tossed aside.

STATEMENT OF LEROY ADOLPH, CHAIRMAN,
PUBLIC HOUSING COMMITTEE, METROPOLITAN
COUNCIL ON HOUSING

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, it may come as a surprise, or for lack of a better word, a little odd to you gentlemen, that a group of people—little people who have very little money, would go to the expense of coming here to Washington from New York, for what might seem to you as an unnecessary reason. You may well wonder why we, the members of the Public Housing Committee of the Metropolitan Council on Housing, would go to the great effort of obtaining and investigating the law and the amendments to the law, that you are considering; of writing to you for speaking time; or printing and distributing letters and leaflets to public housing tenants and interested people to make them more knowledgeable about what is happening at these Committee hearings, so that they will be motivated and mobilized into coming to Washington to take part in the business of this Committee. This we have

done by mailing, phoning, making personal contacts, or any other methods we could devise.

The answer to all of this is quite simple. One of the proposed amendments that is being considered by this committee concerns us. It concerns us so directly that we could not, in all good conscience, pass up the opportunity to have our say. For many, many months we have been looking for just such an opportunity to have our "day in court"; to be able to get across to a group such as yourselves, who can possibly make a change, the plight of the Public Housing tenant and the many day-to-day problems with which he must live.

At its inception, the concept of Public Housing was to help people, not hinder and frustrate them. It was, in fact, intended to aid those people who have meager funds at their disposal to at least live with some kind of dignity in safe, decent homes—at rents they could afford. But somewhere along the line this original concept has been either forgotten, ignored or pushed aside by needless, senseless wars, the race to outer space or some other very "pressing and important matters", leaving people who provide the "lion's share" of the financial support for the "important matters" to fend for themselves with not much to fend with, after taxes.

The Public Housing Tenant does not want charity, favors, or welfare. All they want is what is coming to them under the original concept of Public Housing—a decent home in which to house and raise their children. We cannot do this under the present conditions. Every year we are subjected to salary reports, which very often result in some sort of rent increase if there is any kind of an increase in salary. It seems that under the present set-up, that those in public housing who aspire to a better life for themselves and their families financially by working for job promotions or salary increases are penalized by getting a subsequent rent increase or by being evicted because of "over income for continued occupancy." Gentlemen, this has got to stop. My landlord, the New York City Housing Authority, claims it must have more money to run the Authority. It normally receives subsidies from City, State and Federal sources. If this is not enough to do the job, the final alternative is usually the Public Housing tenant himself. We are living from day to day with the threat of continuous rent increases hanging over our heads.

We cannot plan anything on a long range basis such as higher education for our children, an occasional vacation, or any of the pleasantries of life, which is no life at all. The present situation in Public Housing is breeding a generation of liars because we must train our children to lie and scheme about what they earn and how they earn it, because this is the only way that we can survive. There will be no astronauts coming out of the Public Housing system, because all of one's life is taken up with making it on this planet; as a matter of fact our kids will hardly be able to compete in a very competitive world, for the same reasons.

What we came to Washington today for is to ask you to seriously consider favorably any means by which the yearly subsidy to the New York City Housing Authority and all such other Housing Authorities that handle people like ourselves can be increased in order to take the pressure off the tenant. This may be our last opportunity to alleviate the frustration that can only lead to either a deep depressing apathy or vandalism or violence of some nature against what they feel is their oppressor, the Housing Authority.

I realize that this may be a naive approach to the problem and nothing is ever that simple; but as simple, uncomplicated people with the normal needs of people of our station in life, we have no other approach to the problem, which is just one of many that

plague the tenants in public housing. We have been asked many times: if Public Housing is so difficult to live in and with, why not leave, move out? Our answer to this is another question: Move and go where? Back to the slums, with the rats and roaches? Unfortunately, our families in Public Housing, which include widowed or husband-less women with small children, senior citizens on small pensions or social security, welfare families have no other choice but to stay and live and fight the on-going day to day problems. It is our firm belief that Public Housing is the answer to the nation's housing problems, and can be made to work, if the powers that be address themselves to the problems that exist and overcome them, one by one, like it was done in the attempt to reach the moon. We also feel that as elected representatives of the people you must do whatever you can to better the lot of these many families. In New York alone we have some 600,000 people living in Public Housing who are depending on the outcome of this Committee's hearings. Please don't let these many people down. Do whatever you can, anyway you can. I'm sure that they will know how to show their appreciation. Thank you.

PUBLIC HOUSING TENANTS' BILL OF RIGHTS
(Adopted June 24, 1968)

PREAMBLE

We 600,000 public housing tenants constitute a citizenry larger than most American cities. To solve the myriad problems confronting us, and to guarantee a full, healthy and happy life for our families, we demand the right of self determination. This Bill of Rights is our platform to accomplish this end. To build productive communities, we must control our own destiny.

The first section of this Bill of Rights concerns those of us now living in public housing. The second section concerns those who want to live in public housing

1. All rules and regulations promulgated by the New York City Housing Authority which discriminate against tenants by reason of race, religion, national origin, sex, age, political beliefs or affiliations, or because the tenant's former residence was a slum, a ghetto, or both, or because of marital status, or the status of any children in the family unit, including any other forms of discrimination, are hereby declared to be absolutely void.

2. Before any rule or regulation may be adopted, there shall be a public hearing. At a reasonable time thereafter the rule or regulation shall be submitted for the consideration of all the tenants in a vote, by secret ballot, and a majority of those voting shall be recorded in favor of such rule or regulation, before it may be adopted.

3. Tenants shall have the right to be secure and safe in their homes. The Authority shall provide sufficient trained personnel and equipment as a guarantee.

4. No person may be evicted from public housing unless the following rules are adhered to:

(a) Notice of the commencement of eviction proceedings must be given to the tenant and simultaneously to the Chairman of the Tenants' policy committee.

(b) The tenant may be represented by counsel, or by any person designated by the tenant.

(c) The tenant shall be permitted to confront his accusers and submit evidence in contradiction thereof.

(d) The board or others in charge of making the decision to evict or not to evict shall be composed of tenants residing in public housing.

(e) The tenant shall have the right to appeal an adverse decision to the Division Committee.

5. The Housing Authority shall publish financial statements of the Authority, de-

tailoring administrative, capitalization, maintenance and operating costs, etc., and in addition shall detail income. The financial statement shall indicate loans made to the Housing Authority, the lender, and the interest rate. The financial statement shall be published twice each year, and a copy thereof shall be delivered to the door of each tenant living in public housing.

6. No rent increase shall be levied without a public hearing, and the request therefor shall be based upon the financial statement and justified by sound financial practice.

7. No fines or charges shall be levied against the tenant for any reason by the Housing Authority.

8. Immediate steps shall be taken by the Housing Authority to turn over to the tenants control of public housing. In doing so, the general procedure shall be as follows:

A. Elections in each project shall be held to create a Tenants' Policy Committee, which shall be a policy-making body, and which shall appoint the project manager, assistant project manager and superintendent from an appropriate certification list. The Committee shall have the power to discharge said persons.

B. The Tenant Policy Committee of each project within a division shall select one of their number to sit on a Division Committee. The Division Committee shall have the power to investigate and make binding decisions on all matters relating to the administration and operation of the public housing projects within the division.

C. Authority shall be headed by a Board which shall be elected by secret ballot by public housing tenants only. Each division shall have one representative on the Board. The Board shall be in general control of all matters pertaining to public housing, subject to the provisions of this Bill of Rights. Qualifications for the positions on the Board shall be set forth in an addendum to this Bill of Rights.

9. All persons elected to the Tenant's Policy Committee, the Division Committee and the Board, shall serve two year terms.

THE RIGHTS OF PEOPLE WHO WANT TO LIVE IN PUBLIC HOUSING

I. All levels of government must guarantee decent housing to all through the construction of as many public housing apartments as are needed.

II. Assignments of public housing apartments shall be on a first come, first served basis, except for emergencies.

III. The Housing Authority must establish a procedure which assigns each applicant a permanent place on a waiting list and shall make public the number and order of the list, which shall be permanent.

IV. Persons not placed on the list must be notified in writing and given the reason for failure to accept the application. No applicant for public housing may be denied the right to live in public housing, except on absolute proof that the applicant or a member of the family currently constitutes a danger to the other tenants of the projects.

V. All tenant selection bodies must consist of one-third tenants chosen by public housing tenant associations, one-third representatives of non-public housing tenant organizations; and one third New York City Housing Authority staff.

WANTED: A RHODESIAN POLICY

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the ad-

ministration's regrettable reluctance to deal forthrightly with a foreign policy problem whose solution is readily apparent, and which does not call for great wisdom nor effort in its implementation. I am referring to our Government's inexcusable failure to close our Consulate General in Salisbury following the British Government's decision to sever its diplomatic ties in July.

Apparently, our State Department, in a rare and laudable display of decisiveness, has taken the correct position that there is no point in encouraging the illegal, racist regime in Rhodesia by maintaining our mission there. However, the White House, to its discredit, has to date failed to act on this clear-cut recommendation. This failure to demonstrate this Nation's commitment to racial equality abroad is doubly disturbing in the light of increased criticism of the administration's ambivalent attitude towards desegregation domestically.

Our inaction is certainly widening the gap between our often expressed official opposition to the white supremacist Smith regime in Rhodesia and our actual deeds. By failing to withdraw our diplomatic personnel from Salisbury following the adoption by the white minority electorate of an explicitly racially biased constitution, we are also encouraging the continuation of the status quo in all of southern Africa and the perpetuation of racial injustice there.

I commend to all of my colleagues the following excellent editorial on this subject which appeared in today's New York Times, "Wanted: A Rhodesian Policy":

WANTED: A RHODESIAN POLICY

The United States claims that it adheres more strictly than any other country to the mandatory sanctions invoked against Rhodesia by the United Nations Security Council. At the same time, Washington continues to maintain a consulate general in Salisbury, seat of the white-minority regime it says is illegal and immoral.

For most black African governments the explanation for such schizophrenia is simple—and cynical: they do not believe the United States is really opposed to the regimes seeking to perpetuate white domination at any cost in southern Africa.

The valid explanation, however, is even simpler—and equally inexcusable: in Rhodesia, as in other critical areas, the Nixon Administration, after eight months in office, has no policy. In this as in other areas, the much-maligned State Department is not to blame. The responsibility for a policy of no-policy rests with the White House.

Mr. Nixon himself reportedly ordered the sanctions maintained despite some business and Congressional pressure for relaxation. But the White House to date has failed to act on the recommendation of Consul General Paul O'Neill and the State Department that the consulate general in Salisbury be closed.

It is not only the black Africans who are offended by this situation. Britain recalled its Governor General and ended diplomatic and consular ties with Salisbury in July, after Rhodesia's white electorate had approved a racist, despotic Constitution under which Prime Minister Ian Smith will soon proclaim a republic.

The British are astonished that the United States, while agreeing that the Smith regime is illegal, maintains its consulate in what seems to be a fundamental break with London. France, West Germany, Italy and the

Netherlands have also kept their consulates open, reportedly awaiting the American decision.

If the Administration has any interest in retaining some influence in black Africa, as well as in upholding the principles of non-racialism, majority rule and the rule of law on that continent, there is only one decision it can make. It ought to be made without further delay.

DDT TODAY

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable debate recently about possible dangers of using hard insecticides on food crops. Recently, Mr. John D. Worthington, editor of the Aegis, wrote a fine editorial on this subject which I would like to share with my colleagues by including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

DDT TODAY

Much has been written in national magazines, newspapers, and presented on television about the amount of DDT in our environment, the damage it has already done to fish, wildlife and maybe man, and how it continues to cause alarm among conservationists and the general public.

Within the last five years, scientific equipment has been developed which will detect as little as one tenth or even one hundredth of a part per million of a given chemical in a mass of other material. Through use of this equipment man has become much more aware of chemical contaminants in his environment. Also studies of the long term effects of chemical exposure and accumulation by animals have aroused interest about our changing environment.

DDT is a hard insecticide since it is one which doesn't readily break down into harmless by-products when used on agricultural crops. Within the last two decades many new insecticides have been developed. Most of these have much quicker knock-down power than DDT, but are rendered harmless to man and animals within just a few hours or days after being applied and exposed to weathering by sunshine, wind, and air circulation.

DDT can't be made safe. It wouldn't be DDT if we changed the chemical composition of the material. However, farmers can and do use other chemicals which quickly break-down shortly after use. This is the case with modern agriculture in Harford county today. Probably any good able-bodied man could pick-up and carry at one time all the DDT used on agricultural crops in one year in Harford county. In fact, few if any insecticides are used on crops grown for animal feeds today. New, quick break-down chemicals have replaced DDT for insect control on fruits and vegetables used for both fresh market and processing.

This is generally the picture over the entire nation today. DDT is used very little in agriculture. The various state universities which pass along recommendations to farmers through their Cooperative Extension Services have almost completely eliminated any recommendations for DDT. Maryland's Cooperative Extension Service recommends no DDT for use by farmers and has recommended none for several years.

DDT is one of our first synthesized or man-made insecticides. It has done much to prevent damage to food and relieve suffering of

man the world over. However, because of its past good record there is no justification for continuing to use it if equally as effective chemicals are available.

PITTSBURGH'S AMERICAN WIND SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, Pittsburgh's unique American Wind Symphony Orchestra, now in its 13th year of providing free summer concerts on a river barge in Pittsburgh, and in towns along the Ohio, was hailed recently by a seasoned New York music critic who admits he is jealous.

As a Pittsburgher, and a member of the advisory board of the American Wind Symphony Orchestra, I am very pleased that our city, which is known as the Gateway to the West, and the heartland of industry and research, also offers much along cultural lines. As the article points out, the city owes a great deal to the ingenuity and creativity of its director, Robert Boudreau for bringing us the imaginative and diverse program which the wind symphony boasts.

I include at this point in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues the very appealing article from a recent issue of New York, "Windy Nights on the River" by Alan Rich:

WINDY NIGHTS ON THE RIVER

(By Alan Rich)

If life insurance underwriters knew the things music critics have to do to make a living, our profession would probably be put in the same bracket with coal miners and racing-car drivers. On a recent night in Pittsburgh, for example, I found myself standing on the edge of a barge anchored off one of the city's parks, an expanse of 30-foot-deep polluted river in front of me, an orchestra behind me, the composer whose work had just been performed sitting not 20 feet away . . . and under these circumstances I was expected to deliver into a microphone a criticism of what I had just heard. The fact that I am here to tell you about all this today attests to a new level of Christian charity among my fellow creatures.

The American Wind Symphony Orchestra, which is the group I went out to hear, is now in its 13th year. It is reconstituted each summer out of fine young professional musicians from around the country (plus, this year, Canada, Israel and Korea) who are personally auditioned during the winter by the orchestra's founder and conductor, a 42-year-old firebrand by the name of Robert Boudreau. The group plays a month or so in Pittsburgh, on a barge which Boudreau bought and had converted into a concert stage complete with overhead acoustical clouds and a pretty good sound system, and then the whole shebang gets tugged down the Ohio River, tying up at towns along the way for more concerts. The orchestra also owns another, more seaworthy barge that has gone down the Mississippi and up the Atlantic Coast.

And what do you think this group plays? Richard Rodgers medleys and Sousa marches? Well, it does, sometimes, as en-

cores or program-ending toetappers, but let me tell you some of the things I heard. A new big piece by Penderecki. Pieces for orchestra and tape by Henk Badings and Bo Nilsson (who is not the same as Bo Polk, but is a very far-out Swedish composer). A concerto for percussion and orchestra by Mayuzumi, and other challenging new works from Japan. A new piece by—oh, well—Alan Hovhaness. And who do you suppose commissioned all this new music, got it published (by C. F. Peters), performed and now recorded? The American Wind Symphony of Pittsburgh, that's who.

I left Pittsburgh, therefore, jealous as could be, driving through torrential rains to get back to a city whose entire summer musical season consists of the Goldman Band, the Schaefer Beer Festival, a few isolated chamber concerts plus a lot of chestnutty programming by the Metropolitan and Philharmonic. (If you ask me who caused all the rain to fall this summer, I'd say it was the summer-music programmers, not the astronauts on the moon, and it serves them right.) Maybe the cities off the East Coast are culturally naïve, but I will put up with quite a lot of the sort of naïveté that brings new music by Penderecki to an urban park audience.

Boudreau, who looks, talks and operates a little like Joe Papp, is one of these people whom culture has to rely on heavily these days if it is to move ahead. He did the whole job himself, wangling a lot of money out of local industrialists without having to promise that they'd like his programming, bulldozing the city into helping out with every means this side of blackmail. His sense of p.r. is fantastic. One morning some ex-infantry types who were having a convention in town wandered down to the barge during rehearsal and got a little obstreperous because of the kind of music being played. Boudreau stopped the rehearsal, chatted with the crowd about his farm and his financial problems, played them a few marches and sent them away charmed and well-behaved.

He had invited me to come out (and Harold Schonberg a couple of weeks before), because he has been peeved at the way local critics have turned up their noses at his concerts. Pittsburgh is not exactly a hotbed of musical creativity, and is badly in need of critics who can deal with new music with some authority. In a sense, I suppose you could say Boudreau was invoking the New York magic to snow the locals, and I'm not sure how I feel about the ethics involved.

But what the hell. The job of getting culture off its collective fanny and moving ahead in some direction is not a local matter but a worldwide one, and if critics with at least a minimal sensitivity to the nature of new music happen now to be concentrated in New York, that's a temporary accident which, hopefully, will someday be corrected. Besides, my trip revealed ways in which New York can take the example of other cities to heart.

This had to do with the kind of music Boudreau has commissioned and performed (quite sympathetically, by the way), and also with the effect this music has been having on the musicians in the orchestra. The average age of the players, from appearances, is about 22; most of them will go into symphony orchestras, or perhaps into high school or conservatory teaching. Exposed to really challenging music in strange styles, and to such problems as improvisation and mixed tempos, they dig in with an enthusiasm that is not yet dimmed by overprofessionalism. I got a big hand when I told the crowd that the New York Philharmonic couldn't play some of this hard music as well as these kids did, and I meant it. Pittsburgh isn't exactly on the frontier, as New Yorkers sometimes like to think, but it can be a refreshing and sobering experience to watch such Dan'l

Boone types as Boudreau holding off the Indians. We could use a few like him right here.

ECONOMIC IMPACT OF THE SST

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the controversy raging around the supersonic transport is many faceted. There are strong arguments on both sides of this important issue, and I hope that they will be duly aired before the Congress acts.

One important aspect of the question, because of the considerable initial cost of the proposal, is economic. It is important for us to realize that the SST will be of great benefit to the economy of this country. It will create about 50,000 jobs directly involved in SST development and production. These jobs will be spread among the two prime contractors, Boeing and General Electric, the major subcontractors, and the many thousands of suppliers and vendors located in almost every State of the Nation. Using the economist's multiplier factor of 4 to 5 for total employment impact, a total of 200,000 to 250,000 "new" jobs will be created, with an estimated payroll of about \$2 billion.

The SST will also mean more business to the airlines. Today U.S. airlines employ more than 250,000 people and have an annual payroll exceeding \$2 billion. While an exact figure cannot be forecast for the contribution of the SST, it is obvious that an estimated tenfold increase in passenger traffic is going to require a substantial increase in employees and payroll. If market potential estimates are accurate, the airlines will employ about 780,000 people in 1986, with an annual payroll of over \$12 billion.

The SST means money in the bank for the people employed by airlines, airplane manufacturers, and the many large and small companies who depend on the airplane in their business. Of the more than 1.4 million people employed in the aerospace industry, the Nation's largest manufacturing employer, more than 600,000 people are employed in aircraft research, development, and production.

I think it is interesting to note that the production program for the SST is of such scope that the personal and corporate income taxes of those directly involved will produce a return to the Government more than double the prototype expenditure. With foreign sales estimated at approximately \$13 billion, the effect on the U.S. balance of payments will be pronounced.

The SST seems to me to be "good business"—for the aviation industry, yes, but for the Nation as well. It affords the Government the opportunity to participate in a creative, high-technology undertaking which will provide jobs, enrich the economy, and provide the United States with an export product of significant dollar value.